

# **SISTER INDIA**

**A Critical Examination of and a Reasoned**

**REPLY TO**

**Miss KATHARINE MAYO'S**

**“MOTHER INDIA”**

**BY**

**“WORLD-CITIZEN”**

**SISTER INDIA OFFICE,**

**CHURCHGATE STREET,**

**BOMBAY,**

**1927.**

**Price Rs. 2-8-0.**

**( *All rights reserved by the Proprietor, "Sister India"* )**

**Printed by M. N. Kulkarni, at The Karnatak Press,  
318A, Thakurdwar, Bombay**

**and**

**Published by Mr. S. G. Warty, M. A., Proprietor, "Sister India",  
at the Sister India Office, Church-Gate Street,  
Fort, Bombay.**

TO  
ALL RACES AND PEOPLES  
OF  
THE WORLD





## PREFACE

---

“Sister India” as this book is named, though undoubtedly a reply to Miss Katharine Mayo’s “Mother India,” is by no means a mere rejoinder as some of the books and articles recently published are. It has a better and wider object in view and that is to place before the public at large, in India, in the United Kingdom and in America, a truthful picture of the social and political ills of India and their causes, and to discuss in the light of this picture the conclusions arrived at by Miss Mayo and spread broad-cast by her in her own country and throughout the civilized world.

In writing such a book, the temptation to malign the social life and customs of Western countries, especially the United Kingdom and the United States, is almost irresistible. Some writers have freely indulged in merciless exposure of the West and have even thrown dirt in return, out of resentment for Miss Mayo’s vile and insidious attacks. But so far as has been possible, this author has consciously avoided such attacks on Western institutions. At the same time, cases necessarily arise, when to illuminate the picture and present it in its proper setting, or to remove obvious misunderstandings, one is compelled to draw to a considerable

extent upon the social customs and usages of the West by way of comparison.

I have endeavoured herein to present things as they appear to an ordinary self-respecting Indian, and as they ought to appear also to an unbiassed observer. If to a certain class of readers even this moderate presentation in its political aspects appear ungenerous or uncalled for, my only apology would be that Miss Mayo is mainly responsible for stirring up the dying embers and raising anew for fresh discussion, issues which have long been considered dead or of mere academic interest. I am a man of moderate views in politics and not only have I never borne grudge against British rule in India, but have always considered that India can hope to attain full self-government under British rule alone. It is, therefore, most painful to me to dip into the past history of British Indian administration and bring out some of its inglorious chapters.

But of late it has become the practice with British politicians to remind Indians in season and out of season that they are a conquered people, that they are a subject race and that they have to depend solely and wholly on British mercy. Extravagant claims are also made that British rule rescued India from anarchy and views are expressed that but for the presence of the British in India, this country would relapse into anarchy. All such claims and views are artfully incorporated in

“Mother India” by its American Authoress, and in order to expose to the full the untruths and half-truths contained in that book, a correct presentation of the whole question in its historical setting has been found necessary.

In a discussion of this character, some warmth is necessarily generated. It is not easy to avoid it especially when we feel strongly and write sincerely. And who will not feel strongly in a matter like this? When the whole manhood and womanhood of India are held up to ridicule, when their past and their present are unscrupulously maligned, when the extinction of the whole Hindu race in the near future is earnestly wished for, which self-respecting Indian would shrink from presenting an erect posture and a bold attitude? Yet on the whole, readers will particularly note, this author has not consciously imported any undue warmth.

One possible misunderstanding I may remove. Readers are likely to think that because Mr. Ranga Iyer has published his reply to Miss Mayo under the title “Father India”, I have seized upon another convenient name and named my book “Sister India”. The fact is that even before Mr. Ranga Iyer’s book appeared or its name was published, and even before I had even thought of writing a reply myself, it had occurred to me that if a reply was to be given at all it should be under the title “Sister India”.

It is my firm conviction that if all the races and peoples of the world outside India would understand India rightly, they would all treat her as a "Sister" country, to whom some affectionate service and assistance from them are due. With these words I place this book in the hands of my readers.

THE AUTHOR.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Introduction ... ..	1
CHAPTER I. Confounded Confusion ...	18
„ II. Physical Menace ? ...	26
„ III. How Yarns Are Spun ...	35
„ IV. Good, Bad or Indifferent ...	42
„ V. For Lack of Opportunity ...	48
„ VI. More Political Than Social ...	64
„ VII. Safety First ? ...	73
„ VIII. The Myth Exploded ...	81
„ IX. Whose Driving Force ? ...	93
„ X. Sex-Mad ... ..	102
„ XI. A Holiday for Truth ...	110
„ XII. Massacre of the Innocents ...	120
„ XIII. Marriage and Child-birth ...	130
„ XIV. The Position of Women—I ...	143
„ XV. The Position of Women—II ...	155
„ XVI. Disease and Destitution ...	166
„ XVII. Whose Fault ? ...	177
„ XVIII. Eat Beef or Remain Poor ...	189
„ XIX. If the British Withdrew... ..	203
„ XX. Forward March ... ..	222
„ XXI. Epilogue ... ..	240
Appendix I ... ..	i
Appendix II ... ..	iv



## INTRODUCTION

When the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Library first received a copy of Miss Mayo's "Mother India", the trained eye of the experienced Librarian who is himself no orthodox Hindu but has brought practical social reform in his personal living, did not find in the book anything that could be of value to readers. It was a book full of dirt, full of mud-slinging, outraging all sense of veracity, truthfulness and decency, and the librarian promptly rejected its inclusion in the library.

But the book received quite a different reception in the West. Millions of copies, it is said, were sold in England and America, and the publishers and the author made huge profits. Excellent reviews of the book appeared in the press and the author was proclaimed as the great discoverer of truth.

"India and her truths lay hid in night,  
God said, 'let Mayo be,' and all was light."

Many protests were raised by Englishmen themselves who had known this country and the people for years past, against the acceptance of Miss Mayo's statements and observations as truth by the English readers. These protests did one good, that to many Englishmen, Miss Mayo did not appear to be an entirely trustworthy writer. Yet these voices of protests

were soon hushed, because they were proving inconvenient to interested persons. The press on the whole was interested in damaging the reputation of India and the Indians and it would no longer allow any presentation of the other side of the medal. Even a well-reasoned, moderately worded reply, signed by such responsible leaders as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, late Law Member of the Government of India, Dr. R. P. Paranjpye, Member of the India Council in England, Sir A. C. Chatterjee, High Commissioner for India in England, and many other distinguished Indians, was refused publication even by the "London Times", which is supposed to lay down a high standard of journalistic honesty.

If in a free country like England there is a chorus of approval of Miss Mayo's deductions and findings, if the other and more responsible voice is suppressed by national journals as they do in a state of war, if even the most distinguished Indians have been refused a hearing, what moral can we draw from this? Does England believe that it is in a state of war with India that her press should suppress the Indian case altogether in order that the whole nation may concentrate its force against India? How else can the attitude of the press be explained?

But that is not the only thing that is distressing about England and the West in general, including America. The taste evinced by the vast numbers of readers there in reading such a dirty,



indecent book as Miss Mayo's "Mother India", the universal reception given to the appearance of such blasphemous writing, show conclusively to what mental degradation society in the West has fallen. It appears as if better things they are incapable of appreciating. Their moral standard has gone so low that only sensational news, and dirty scandals are the indiscriminate diet with which they feed their minds. We have heard it said, that the majority of English and American readers, and especially the ladies have developed a special liking for divorce cases, immoral news and society scandals, and often they read nothing else. Not until we learnt of the universal reception given to "Mother India" in England or America, did we realise adequately the truth regarding English readers' immoral tastes. To us, this has been the measure of their mental degradation and moral fall.

Mr. Lecky, the great English historian, well observes in his introduction to the "History of Rationalism in Europe", that the success of any opinion depends "much less upon the force of its arguments or upon the ability of its advocates, than upon the pre-disposition of society to receive it"; and that pre-disposition, he further observes, depends upon the intellectual type of the age. When the Englishmen and Americans have developed a morbid taste to gulp down the stuff that Miss Mayo has offered them, one can imagine what "intellectual

type" they represent to-day. Let Englishmen and Americans dive within their own selves, search their innermost hearts, and realise it for themselves.

As long ago as when Lord (then Mr.) Morley's "Compromise" first appeared, the author deplored therein that the great humanitarian causes which animated and agitated British democracy in the past such as the abolition of slavery, religious equality, etc. having become accomplished facts, have left little noble for Englishmen to aim at as an ideal, and he feared that British society might deteriorate on that account. Have his fears come out to be true? Has the carpenter, for want of anything else to do, been using his tool on himself and rendering his mind thereby not only incapable of noble pursuits and generous motives but highly susceptible to the influence of lower sentiments and degrading tastes?

It is impossible to doubt that the main object of Miss Mayo's book is political. Otherwise one cannot explain the persistent insistence by her at every favourable opportunity on her being regarded as an impartial and disinterested observer. She wants to make capital out of her American nationality as if even an ordinary man cannot see through the thin veil. If Miss Mayo had no political object in view, if her heart was truly humanitarian and was wrung with pity for those who suffered from the social evils prevalent among the Hindus, where was the neces-

sity for her to discuss the burning politics of the country ?

It would have served her purpose adequately if she had drawn by her inimitable style and picturesque manner of writing, pointed attention to the social customs and usages, detrimental to the progress of the country. Instead, she points out these evils to damn the people in the eyes of the outside world in the most unmistakable language as if Western society is free from such evils. Beyond doubt, she has not meant well to Hindu society. Her attacks on social customs are a means of marring their political aspirations.

The great object of the book is to vindicate British rule in India. The book is a grand apology for British administration. But if it were merely that, there would not be much to complain against. Many such books have appeared in the past, are appearing to-day and will appear in the future. They show the other side of the case, and we would not be sorry for their publication. But Miss Mayo's book falls under a different category altogether. It is a dishonest book. Under the guise of discussing social evils, she insidiously attempts to damage the prospects of political advance.

To her the British official is an angel sent by God for the deliverance of India, a willing martyr toiling and suffering for India's cause. But the bravest and greatest of Indian patriots and leaders,

men who have made life-long sacrifices, are all degraded beings, mere noisy *babus*, irresponsible critics, incompetent and incapable, who are wholly and purely selfish and never have any interest for the masses.

Does she express these views honestly and frankly? No. On the contrary she tries to avoid a frank expression of them. But like a cunning artist, she takes opportunity to suggest on almost every page of her book that every little good to India has come from the British officer and every evil has resulted either from social customs or from the attempts of the Indian leaders to improve India's political status.

She desires her readers to believe that she is "commissioned by no one" to write the book; and she states with great emphasis that she is "neither an idle busybody nor a political agent, but merely an ordinary American citizen seeking test facts to lay before her own people." Only credulous people can credit such stories as these. The internal evidence of the book is against her. Her conduct after the publication of the book is against her. The exultation of the British public at the appearance of the book is against her.

The Indian mind is fully convinced that hers was no self-appointed mission. It is impossible to conceive that any true-born American lady, bred up in the free atmosphere of the United States, would

ever undertake of her own accord mischievous and wicked mission to India, to damn the Hindu race and represent it as a “physcial menace” to the world. The incentive and inducement must have come from an external source. Those who remember what lies were spread about the Germans during the war through British sources can easily imagine what the sources are.

When Beelzebub “pleaded his devilish counsel” to seduce the first parents of mankind in paradise, the counsel, Milton is careful to tell us, was “first devised by Satan, and in part proposed”; and he adds :—

“.....For whence  
But from the author of all ill, could spring  
So deep a malice, to confound the race  
Of mankind in one root ?”

“The Isles of Fear” which Miss Mayo has written about the Philippine Islands, must have been her best qualification and recommendation for being entrusted with the task of writing a similar book regarding India.

We have said above that “Mother India” is a dishonest book, and the reason that we gave for calling it dishonest was that under the guise of pointing out the social evils in a disinterested manner, she makes vile and insidious attacks on Indian politicians and obstructs their aspirations. If she had written her book under a political nomenclature,

we would have called her honest, whatever her opinions may be. Most Indians regard Sir Michael O'dwyer and Lord Sydenham as enemies of India. But their views are straight and clear and one cannot charge them with dishonesty. One can argue with them because their points are open to argument.

Or again, if Miss Mayo had simply written a social treatise without bringing in politics, however distorted her representation might have been, we could at least have given her the credit of an honest, though incorrect, outlook; but when she twists these social facts to political ends, her real object is out. She wants to instil political poison in the minds of readers, while apparently discussing social problems. She does her vilest work by suggestion and implication. Thus the reader is thoroughly misled, and where already exists a pre-disposition to misunderstand, the effect on the reader can be easily imagined.

It is the artful and cunning manner in which the particular view and the political poison are injected into the cells of the brain, that is most detestable. The reader is off his guard, he thinks she is discussing social evils, but unwittingly and unintentionally gets infected with her political poison. If the reader knew that she was pressing a particular view upon him, he would argue out the view with her in his



mind and examine her arguments. But he is not allowed to go through this open process.

But that is only one aspect of her dishonesty. There is another aspect which deserves to be pointed out. It has now been an established fact, that Miss Mayo has in her book completely mis-represented and mis-quoted both Mr. Gandhi and Dr. Rabindranath Tagore. Both these great sons of India have replied to her and brought her mistakes home to her, and resented her taking liberty with their writings.\* Did Miss Mayo deliberately mis-represent these gentlemen in order to damage their reputation or to gain her political ends, or was the mistake *bona fide*? In any case, when the mistake was pointed out and brought to her notice, was it not her duty to apologise to these gentlemen, who are not ordinary persons but men with an international reputation, men whom the world will always count among her great men? Did she do it? She did not. What does it prove? It proves beyond doubt that she never came to India with an honest desire, that her whole object was to "humiliate" India, as Dr. Tagore puts it, and that all her professions of disinterestedness, impartiality, &c. are false. By the way, it is astonishing that not a single paper in England or America, though passing other criticisms on her, has as yet held her to shame and ridicule for her mean

---

\* See appendices I and II. The misrepresentations are discussed in Chapter XII.

and deliberate mis-prerpresentations of the views of Mr. Gandhi and Dr. Tagore. Is a liar respected in the West ? 'Tis a shameful thing to lie, said Lord Tennyson.

Gandhi and Tagore are not the only instances of men who have been mis-represented and with whose writings Miss Mayo has taken liberty in a highly improper manner. These two we have known because they are the most pre-eminent personalities and have also cared to reply. Hosts of other gentlemen have been mis-represented and mis-quoted. Only the names of few are given, of whom some have already repudiated the views and the statements put in their mouths. Of the numberless others whose names are not given, but whose opinions are quoted or mis-quoted, it is difficult to say anything with certainty. But there is strong reason to think that all along the line, the whole process has been most unscrupulously handled, without any regard to truth.

We have not yet, however, reached the climax. In spite of this her clear, dishonest motive, she has the effrontery to write in her book with an air of injured innocence as follows :—

“ In shouldering this task myself, I am fully aware of the resentments I shall incur : of the accusations of muck-raking ; of injustice ; of material-mindedness ; of lack of sympathy ; of falsehood perhaps ; perhaps of prurience. But the fact of



having seen conditions and their bearings, and being in a position to present them, would seem to deprive one of the right to indulge a personal reluctance to incur consequences."

This is language well worthy of great martyrs to the cause of truth. Alas, how altogether misplaced in the mouth of Miss Mayo !

But her impudence still lingers in her even after she was thoroughly exposed. She complained in an interview that she was being vilified—herself the culprit who had vilified others and lied about things and men. She even dares to write in "Liberty" taking credit to herself that she has uncovered Indian society for the first time to the gaze of the world. Yes, Miss Mayo, draw nude, indecent pictures out of your diseased imagination, prostitute your art to render them life-like, and present them to your West as the faithful photograph of India. Who can doubt that the morbid tastes which the West has come to cultivate will ensure immense sale to your pictures ?

In his famous novel the "Laodicean," the late Thomas Hardy has very artistically illustrated the almost fatal consequences of a highly distorted photograph. Yet Miss Mayo may remember that even the fatalistic Thomas Hardy could not represent the distorted photograph as fatal in the end. The mystery was unlocked and the mischief exposed in time for things to right themselves.

In the last chapter of "Mother India," Miss Mayo affirms that she has stated living facts of India to-day, and observes in a challenging mood that "they can easily be denied, but they cannot be disproved or shaken." How can you shake a fact which has not been established at all? How can you ask us to disprove a lie when the burden is on you to establish it as a fact? You must first bring your evidence and prove your facts. When you speak only on hearsay and out of your prejudiced mind entangled in pre-conceived notions, how are people to disprove it? They can only deny it. Suppose some mischievous writer states that the majority of unmarried women in America are given to unnatural practice and challenges you to shake or disprove the statement, can you do it? Is it at all possible to do it? If again, some Indian visit England and after carrying out what he calls an investigation into the social and sexual conditions in that country, give out as the result of his research that there is very little chastity found among the English ladies, which Englishman can disprove the statement? In such cases, the original fact itself should have been fully established. It is not the mere assertion that constitutes a fact. It is the unchallenged evidence and proof that you bring that establishes a fact. But when your facts are mere assertions of your own, based either on hearsay or your imagination and fanciful interpretation, with what face can you ask others to disprove them?

Disprove first, if you dare, the hypothetical statement that the majority of unmarried women in the United States are given to unnatural vice, and then ask for the evidence to disprove your assertions.

Such are the assertions disguised as facts by Miss Mayo which have been propagated in America and England to the edification of the Western readers. Sane and unprejudiced men, who are admittedly above national prejudices have condemned the book in unequivocal tones. Says Lord Sinha :—  
 “Her picture is totally out of focus, and I am sorry to say that it is a deliberate, calculated lie, the whole of it. She has libelled and maligned almost every great man in India. I also know that every single Anglo-Indian official considers that the book is not only false but mischievous. I think she says in her book that Indian mothers teach their children unnatural vices. I could conceive of nothing more atrociously false than that statement, and I asked half a dozen members of the Indian Medical Service, who have spent each of them more than 25 years in India, as to whether they had believed her story. They assured me that they had no more heard of it than I have, and they were convinced that it is a false story.”

An English divine, Rev. J. Tyssul Davis also spoke in the same strain. “Those who read the book” said he, “will get a mischievously one-sided and false view-point, if they do not get other evidence from

an impartial source. The statement regarding the incidence of diseases, the spread of epidemics, the causes of infantile mortality, and the physical deterioration of the people of India, could only be regarded as a mixture of truths and falsehoods. There are fourteen volumes of the 'Life and Labour of London' by the Rt. Hon. Charles Booth in which are recorded facts of misery, too demoralising to dwell upon. Mr. Upton Sinclair and others have also helped us to see through the surface of Western civilization."

Indians are advised—that it is a well-meaning advice nobody need doubt, to remember the indictments in the book and set their house in order. The Manchester Guardian observed that "Mother India" was a book for Englishmen to forget and Indians to remember. This is indeed a counsel of perfection. Would Englishmen ever forget the book? So far as one can see ahead, there is no prospect of that happening. To the average Britisher, it is a Godsend. He can thrust it into the face of the most determined Indian. No creature on earth will make a fuller use of the book than the average Englishman to blacken India's name and obstruct her political progress. The first-fruits have already appeared and proved detrimental to Indian interests and there can be no mistaking as to others that will follow. The Manchester Guardian's advice therefore to Englishmen has fallen on deaf ears.

So far as Indians are concerned, they will undoubtedly remember the book, but for a reason they

alone can rightly appreciate. The Guardian's advice to us to remember the book presumes a capacity in the book, to stimulate our social reform activities. That presumption is wholly unfounded. The book, by its wilful misrepresentations and mischievous distortions of our social life, has so antagonised the people, that there is growing a tendency in the opposite direction to overrate the Hindu manners and customs even where they are wrong, on national grounds. The Hindus, even the educated as a rule, have begun to feel that even their worst social ills are not so devitalising morally or physically as the social ills in the West. In these circumstances, the Hindu social reformers are considerably handicapped in their work. Miss Mayo's "Mother India" has thus done injury to the cause of social reform in India; and who can mistake the political motive behind the book?

But Indians would remember the book for another reason. The book is designed to humiliate India in the eyes of the world. Is it possible for self-respecting Indians to forget this insult? When their whole civilization is held up to ridicule, when things dearest to them are represented as contemptible, when even their religion and philosophy are impugned, which of the Hindus, be he meek or be he bold, can afford to remain unconcerned about it? Yes, it is the duty of every Indian to bear in mind this insult though he is at present impotent effectually to resent it. Not



those who insult others, but those that are insulted can truly understand what a national insult implies. Even the little child with its feelings yet not sufficiently developed, feels the insult to its parents more than the insult to itself. Would not then the full-grown Hindu, whatever his miserable position at the present day and under foreign rule may be, feel and remember the insult to his civilization and culture, to his woman-kind and to his religious notions? Tourists from all the world come to India and blaspheme us because we are under a foreign yoke. If we had our own national Government, things would not certainly be so bad as that.

The true spirit, the right perspective, in which a study of the customs and morals of other people than our own should be approached, was laid down in his introduction to a book connected with India published in 1900, by the late Mr. Alfred Webb. The book has long been forgotten and Mr. Webb's words also. But they deserve resurrection. Said Mr. Alfred Webb:—

“When we dilate upon the immorality of the ‘heathen’,” do we sufficiently consider the scenes enacted in the streets of our great towns, especially our garrison towns, at night? There is more that the ordinary Indian visitor to Europe is likely to see (say at the Paris Salon) difficult to reconcile with a high standard of morality than anything the ordinary European visitor is likely to see in India. Do

we remember that in many of the most professedly Christian nations prostitution is an established system? Do we forget that but for the revelations of two American ladies the regular supply of pleasing prostitutes to British soldiers would still be sanctioned and encouraged by British officers? During a short visit to India I found the cantonment system approved by all "Christian" officials and condemned by all Hindu and other Indians with whom I conversed concerning it."

And then he adds:—

"We have no reason to suppose that all that is of a lowering tendency in Indian customs and observances is not deprecated by enlightened Hindus and other religionists, as all that is bad in our customs and observances is deprecated by enlightened Christians. Let us judge Hinduism and every other ism by its best side, as we desire Christianity should be judged."

---

## CHAPTER I

### **Confounded Confusion.**

The preliminary chapter in Miss Mayo's book is entitled "The Bus to Mandalay." The bus actually takes her not to Mandalay which is in Burma, but to Kalighat which is an obscure part of Calcutta in Bengal. The obvious inference is that Miss Mayo gets confused here as in numerous places in her book and mistakes Mandalay for a part of Calcutta.

This reminds us of an interesting incident when a similar mistake was made by a worthy gentleman in England with an air of confidence regarding his knowledge of geography. It happened that at an important conference held in England in connection with religion, the Bishop of Lahore who was a delegate from India was speaking on a particular resolution. One of the audience on the platform asked his companion, a worthy gentleman, who the speaker was. "He is the Bishop of Lahore" was the reply. "Lahore! where is Lahore?" asked again the first gentleman. "Why", said the other, "don't you know where Lahore is? It is on the west coast of South Africa."

Such is the profound knowledge that most of the persons in England possess of India. But it is not the ignorance that one may deplore. It is the



unhesitating manner and the over-confident attitude in which things wholly untrue are stated as facts, that is so disgusting.

Take again another instance in Miss Mayo's book in the same chapter. In describing "Kali Ghat" she confounds "Kāli" with "Kali". The temple that she visits is dedicated to "Kāli" who is a goddess, and not knowing the distinction between "Kāli" and "Kali" she observes about the goddess that "her spiritual domination of the world began about five thousand years ago and should last nearly four hundred and thirty two thousand years to come."

Now, nobody in India knows any time limit for the domination of the world by any God or Goddess much less by Goddess "Kāli". On the other hand, the period that she speaks of and the number of years mentioned, refer to what is known as "Kali Yug" which means the age of the period of Kali (strife). The Hindu recognises four periods in the history of the world, of which the period of Kali or Kali Yug as it is called is the last. This "Kali" has nothing to do with "Kāli" the Goddess at "Kali Ghat" the first and the most favourite place that Miss Mayo was most delighted to visit.

As mentioned already, there are numerous such mistakes in the book. We should think there are as many as there are pages in the book. We can understand a book to contain some stray mistakes and to be correct on the whole in its conclusion. But

we cannot conceive of any book which contains mistakes of facts on every page, to be correct in any sense in its conclusions, especially when those conclusions are sought to be based on those facts.

The mistakes we mention are of the kind which could have been easily corrected by reference to books. But what shall we say of mistakes where the information has to be gained by observation, by questionings, by close examination and by an intimate contact? In collecting such information, there is always great room for the play of individual prejudices, for unsympathetic outlook, for incorrect observation and misunderstanding, and even for deliberate mis-representation.

It is this latter kind of information and all the personal prejudices that have gone into the collection of it, that have worked havoc in the book and rendered it the most blasphemous treatise ever written about India and her people. For, the Hindu manners and customs as described in the book, are sometimes cruelly exaggerated, sometimes deliberately misrepresented, and are invariably interpreted in the most unwarranted and the least likely manner.

The description of the Goddess "Kālī" is picturesque enough. Miss Mayo has used all her ingenuity to make the Goddess look as ugly as possible. But suppose she is ugly and desires animal blood and sacrifice. Does Miss Mayo consider this to be the

only deity in India ? There are hundreds and thousands of shapes in which God is worshipped in India, and the "Kāli" is one such manifestation, that of the terror that God inspires. In fact, "Kāli" is a non-Aryan deity recognised by the Indian Aryans as a manifestation of the spirit of God in a particular aspect, while non-Aryans were being admitted into the Hindu fold.

The history of Hindu Gods in India is interesting enough. To a foreign observer, it looks as if the Hindu knows not one God but is polytheistic. There can be nothing more mis-leading than that. In his innermost conscience, the Hindu believes in one God and one alone. All the Hindu scriptures beginning with the immemorial Vedas teach him this. If he bows his head before every temple dedicated to any God, it is because he feels that they are but the shapes and manifestations of the same one Supreme Being. As Sir William Hunter in his "Brief History of the Indian People" testifies, almost every Hindu feels that "his outward object of homage is merely his *ishta-devata* or a chosen form under which to adore the Supreme Deity Parameshwara". The Hindu would seem to bow even before a Moslem Mosque or a Christian Church. There cannot be better proof than this, of the Hindu's conviction that there is but one God on this earth, who manifests himself in various forms, to different peoples, and to different religions.

The "Kāli" though manifesting the terrific aspect of God is worshipped in different modes in different houses. She is avowedly to-day the national goddess of Bengal. But it will be found that in 999 out of every 1,000 temples in that Province, the "Kāli" is worshipped as the giver of all good, and not as an evil spirit that is to be appeased. She demands no animal sacrifices, no killing of goats and sheep, but is served solely, wholly and entirely with devotion and prayers, and with sweet-scented flowers and perfumes. One can easily understand the spirit in which "Kāli" is worshipped throughout Bengal, if we mention here that to the great and the most renowned saint of Bengal in modern times Shree Ramkrishna Param-hansa, the presiding deity of worship was "Kāli". Let our readers, especially Western readers, note that saint Ramkrishna is the only one of the Indian saints whose life was written by so great and world-wide a scholar as Max Muller, with a collection of his approved sayings.

Miss Mayo speaks of the killing of goats at "Kāli Ghat" in a derisive manner. But she is wrong in representing that such animal sacrifice is common to all temples of "Kāli". It is very exceptional. It survives only in a few cases, and is fast dying.

The whole world admits that India has been the first country in the world to preach mercy to all animals and give effect to that preaching by stopping

all animal sacrifices. While Western nations were buried in deep barbarism, India learnt from Lord Buddha mercy towards all creatures. Since his day, animal sacrifices have been rare. It may be that they are not entirely given up. Among the aborigines and some priests who minister to them, animal sacrifices are resorted to, but that is only as an exception.

But suppose animal sacrifices are general, as Miss Mayo wishes to suggest. What does it necessarily prove? Do not people in the West kill animals on a large scale and constantly? Here in India, if such innocent creatures are killed, that is at least under the belief that some good will come to those who sacrifice. We revolt against the idea because we take away the life of the innocent creature. But all the same let us not forget that there is connected with it some idea of sacrifice also, the giving up of something material belonging to us. Rightly or wrongly, the motive at least is religious.

What do they do in the West? They rear up animals to kill them for food. That is the main idea. The motive underlying it is no more than animal appetite. The religious notion in India may be said to be wrongly directed or even perverted, and that it is the relic of the past is a sufficient explanation thereof. But in the West, it is wholly the worship of the belly. To appease this demon, thousands of



animals and most innocent creatures are sacrificed every day.

The "Kāli" temple and what goes on there does not in any manner represent the religious practices in India. It is a temple which is an exception rather than the rule. One wonders if there exist more than twenty such temples in the whole of India, where animal sacrifices are the order of the day and dirty beliefs prevail. Not only the Brahmins but also the lower classes in Bengal, even when they worship "Kāli" in their homes or in their village temples, worship her in a truly devotional manner just as the ordinary Hindu ought to do, and the ugly aspects are conspicuously absent and are not even known to them.

It is for this reason that an English theosophist at Calcutta asked Miss Mayo, as she states in her book, why she visited "Kāli Ghat", because as she told her "that is not India. Only the lowest and the most ignorant of Indians are Kāli worshippers."

One significant thing may also be noted in this opening chapter of Miss Mayo's book. It appears as if hers was a casual visit to "Kāli Ghat," and she saw all the things she relates to have seen at one and the same time. If hers was indeed a casual visit, it is most unlikely that all the things should have happened simultaneously as if for her to see. The sacrifices and other things she speaks of are not all daily features. They happen at different times

and occasionally. Either all the things said to have been seen by her were so made to occur simultaneously on the same day by previous design, or she must have seen one or two things personally and put in others in her account by second-hand information or with the help of her own imagination. In any case, it is not a realistic account of her visit. She has filled up the blanks so as to make the account appear as a consistent whole. In other words, she has done what the novelists do, who invent details to picture the life of the world and give it an artistic perfection. Thereby Miss Mayo demolishes her claim to truthfulness.

---

## CHAPTER II

### Physical Menace?

The sum and substance of Miss Mayo's book is that the people of India are a "physical menace" to the whole world, and especially to the United States of America. The object of writing this book, as she states, is to enlighten her countrymen as to the true state of things in India, because "some knowledge of main facts concerning so big and to-day so near a neighbour should be a part of our intelligence and *self-protection*." The main idea suggested is that the Americans for their own self-protection should understand Indian conditions rightly. Otherwise, the Americans may themselves get infected with the poison in India and may perish along with the Hindus.

If there is indeed such poison in India, the Hindus should have been the first to have perished long ago. The Americans are a recent people, not more than three hundred years old, while the Hindus being more ancient than the Greeks and the Romans, have survived them. The intellectual vigour of the race is so profound that even to-day in spite of a thousand years of foreign rule, they can still produce men like Sir J. C. Bose, Dr. Rabindranth Tagore, Sir P. C. Ray, Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar and Mr. Gandhi, whose greatness in the history of mankind



and whose contribution to the knowledge and culture of the world are gratefully admitted by the admiring West.

It is impossible for any sane man to believe that a race, whatever its social draw-backs may be, that can produce in an unbroken manner for more than three thousand years, philosophers and scientists, saints and founders of religions, scholars and statesmen and politicians, founders of empires, poets, musicians and astronomers, can be a "physical menace" to the world.

The suggestion is on the very face of it absurd to the extremest degree, and none but a fool or a knave can entertain such a notion.

In his "India: What can it teach us?", the late Professor Max Muller says: "In the study of the history of the human mind, in the study of ourselves, of our true selves, India occupies a place second to no other country. Whatever sphere of the human mind you may select for your special study, whether it be language or religion or mythology or philosophy, whether it be laws or customs, primitive art or primitive science, everywhere you have to go to India, whether you like it or not, because some of the most valuable and most instructive materials in the history of man are treasured up in India and in India only."

Colonel Todd, the author of the "Rajasthan" speaks in an identical strain. "Where shall we look for

sages" he asks, "like those whose systems of philosophy were the prototypes of those of Greece: to whose work Plato, Thales and Pythagoras were disciples? Where shall we find astronomers whose knowledge of planetary system yet excites wonder in Europe, as well as the architects and sculptors whose work claims our admiration, and the musicians who could make the mind oscillate from joy to sorrow, from tears to smiles, with the change of modes and varied intonation?"

In spite of the unimpeachable evidence of Englishmen and Americans who have lived in India for years and who have made India the subject of life-long study, Miss Mayo with a so-called investigation barely covering a period of cold weather months, comes out with a grave indictment of the whole of the people of India, saying that their social customs and habits and religious practices are a danger to the civilization of the world.

Probably when she drew up this indictment against a whole race, her mind must have been under the live influence of the methods whereby the Anglo-Saxon race has been spreading its civilization throughout the world. Who has not heard how the Anglo-Saxon settlers in America taught the Red Indians to drink liquor in the name of Western civilization and wiped out thereby an originally virile and growing race? Who does not know how in Africa and the obscure places in the world the

advent of British civilization has meant the dwindling of the native races, in number and in physical strength? Even the Maori of New Zealand shows unmistakable signs of decay. Many thoughtful men in England of whom Herbert Spencer was the most prominent have protested from time to time against the general tendency of the Anglo-Saxon race to spread evil in the name of civilization.

Considered from this point of view, would it be unreasonable to regard the Anglo-Saxon race, whether in England or in the United States or in the Dominions, as a real 'menace' to the progress of the other races and civilizations, and on the whole a curse to mankind?

It must have been the consciousness of this fact that influenced Miss Mayo to attribute to the Hindu race what is perhaps true of her own race.

The intercourse of the Hindus with the world outside has not been of to-day. It has continued during the last 2,000 years at least. Has there ever been known through the long course of history during this period any instance of the Hindus proving a "physical menace" to the outside world, whatever the social evils existing among them may be? On the other hand, have not the Hindus for centuries past, one should say until two centuries ago, supplied to the whole world and especially to England and the Continent, the best of her manufactures, the products of her art and industrial skill? Have not the

Hindus also contributed to the knowledge of the world, the development of the sciences, the development of philosophy, and the development of art ?

Even in their fallen condition to-day, the Hindus are undoubtedly a great and highly civilized people. Sir Thomas Munro who rose from the rank of a District officer to be the Governor of a province, who served for more than thirty-two years in India, and acquired an unchallenged knowledge of the Hindus and of the kind of actual life they lived, observed in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1813 as follows :—

“I do not exactly understand what is meant by the civilization of the Hindus. In the higher branches of science, in the knowledge of theory and practice of good Government, in an education which by banishing prejudice and superstition, opens the mind to receive instruction of every kind from every quarter, they are much inferior to Europeans ; but if a good system of agriculture, unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to convenience and luxury ; schools established in every village, for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic ; the general practice of hospitality and charity among each other ; and above all a treatment of the female sex, full of confidence, respect and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilised people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe ;

*and if civilization is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country (England) will gain by the import cargo."* (Italics ours.)

Such are the Hindus of to-day. Major-General Sir O. T. Burne, K.C.S.I., some time Military Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief in India and author of the volume on "Clyde and Straithnairne" in the "Rulers of India" Series, says in that volume :—

"Speaking generally, the typical Hindu is quiet, industrious and tolerant in religious matters unless provoked to excitement. It has been truly said by a distinguished Military writer that the natives of India, both as friends and foes, have proved themselves gallant soldiers not unworthy of being matched with Europeans."

It is these Hindus who, Miss Mayo says, are a "physical menace" to the world, and especially to her own country. Is it the Hindus that are a "physical menace" to the world, or is it the Europeans that are a "physical menace" to the Hindus? When the great "influenza" epidemic reached India from Europe in 1918-19 and carried away about 13 millions of her people and disabled ten times the number, who proved a "menace" to the world? The Hindus suffered by reason of their contact with the West. The West therefore, Europe in particular, has proved a "physical menace" to India. We lay stress here on the sanitary point alone to which

Miss Mayo seems to give the greatest importance. We leave out of account at present the "menace" that Europe has proved to the development of the Indian industries, to the development of the Indian manhood, even to the bare maintenance of Indian population.

We ask again, "Has Miss Mayo or any of our readers heard of what is called the "Ferangi" disease?" This is "Syphilis" which India never knew until the advent of the Europeans in India, which disease was in fact introduced into India by the Europeans and is on that account known as "Ferangi" (European) disease. We say this on the authority of a British Medical Officer in India.

Thus, considered from all points of view, past experience has proved in an unmistakable manner that far from India having ever been or ever being a "physical menace" to the world or to Europe or to America, it is Europe and America that have proved and that will prove a "menace" to India. We call upon Miss Mayo or any of her greatest supporters to challenge our statement with reasons to the contrary.

We shall close this chapter with one or two quotations from Abbe J. A. Dubois to show what even this Catholic Missionary whom Miss Mayo quotes with delight on several occasions with deadly rancour to damn the Indians in the eyes of the world, has to say regarding the Hindus and their civilization as compared with Europeans. Father Dubois



has undoubtedly pointed out many social evils in India, as similar evils exist in every society. Let us try to know what Father Dubois has to say of one people compared with the other. In a letter dated 15th December 1820 (letters from a Christian Missionary) he says :—

“It has at present become a kind of fashion to speak of improvements and ameliorations in the civilization and institutions of the Hindus, and every one has his own plans for effecting them ; but if we could for an instant lay aside our European eyes and European prejudices, and look at the Hindus with some degree of impartiality, we should perhaps find that they are nearly our *equals in all that is good and our inferiors only in all that is bad.*”

Further on in the same letter he observes :—

“In education, in manners, in accomplishments, and in the discharge of social duties, I believe them superior to some European nations and scarcely inferior to any.”

He then makes his opinion still more clear and says :—

“It will perhaps be found that among an equal number of distressed people, the proportion of determined rogues is greater in Europe than in India.”

Be it remembered, these are the views of one who was by no means inclined to express a



favourable opinion regarding the Hindus. In the same letter he frankly makes the following admission :—

“The fact is, that if I have anything to reproach myself with in my writings on the subject of the Hindus, it is to have been rather *too severe in finding fault with them in matters which would perhaps have been a subject of praise to more unbiased authors.*”

---

## CHAPTER III

### **How Yarns Are Spun.**

Miss Mayo completed her survey of India in the course of four or five months and she says she is able to speak with authority regarding the innermost conditions of the Indian house-hold. One may ask in all humility whether such a thing is even physically possible.

India is a vast and continental country inhabited by various races. The Hindu race itself is divided into innumerable castes and communities whose social customs and habits differ as poles asunder from one another. Even a physical journey to visit and inspect the important places and beauty spots in India would require months. How much more time would then a careful and close investigation into social life of varied degrees and different kinds take, even if the investigator happen to be the most trained individual for the purpose?

And then, look at the awe-inspiring and prodigious account of the extensive and all-pervading investigation that she undertook. She says:—"Those journeys I made, plus many others, up and down across the land. Everywhere I talked with the health officers, both Indian and British, of all degrees, going out with them into their respective fields, city or rural,

to observe their tasks and their ways of handling them. I visited hospitals of many sorts and localities, talked at length with the doctors and studied conditions and cases. I made long sorties in the open country from the North-West Frontier to Madras, sometimes accompanying a district commissioner on his tours of chequered duty, sometimes, sitting in, at village councils of peasants or at Indian Municipal Board Meetings, or at court sessions with their luminous parade of life. I went with English nurses into bazars, and court yards and inner chambers and over city roofs, visiting where need called. I saw as well the homes of the rich. I studied the handling of confinements, the care of children and of the sick, the care and protection of food, and the values placed upon cleanliness. I noted the personal habits of various castes and grades, in travel or at home, in daily life. I visited agricultural stations and cattle farms and looked into the general management of cattle and crops. I investigated the animal sanctuaries provided by Indian piety. I saw the schools, discussed with teachers and pupils their aims and experience. The sittings of the various legislatures, all-India and provincial, repaid attendance by the light they shed upon the mind quality of the elements represented. I sought and found private opportunity to question eminent Indians—princes, politicians, administrators, religious leaders, and the frankness of their talk, as to the mental and physical status and conditions of the peoples of India,

thrown out upon the back-ground of my personal observation, proved an asset of the first value."

Such is the grand account of the various methods and agencies employed in her investigations. To the best trained and the most observant of men, with every assistance from all sources available, such an investigation carried out on such comprehensive lines would be a long continued task of years together. But Miss Mayo could accomplish the miracle within a few cold weather months.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from this; either the boastful account of her researches is untrue or that the facts which she caught hap-hazard in her hurry, and which have remained untested for want of time on her part, are so worthless as raw material that no intelligent moral can be drawn from them.

One or two examples may make this clear. Miss Mayo states that she visited the various legislatures in the country. Let us take it that there are at least eight important legislatures worth visiting in India, and that Miss Mayo attended these. You cannot have any proper idea of the work of these legislatures, much less of the various elements composing them and "the mind-quality of the elements represented" unless you attend each of them for one whole session, which lasts for about a month. If Miss Mayo had spent even fifteen days at each legislature, that alone would occupy her for four months,

leaving her no time during cold weather for her other investigations.

Then again, let us suppose, she visited at least 100 hospitals in the country. To investigate the hospital closely would require surely a day. But let us take it that she is able enough to examine two hospitals in a day, and for her sake let us also leave out of consideration the fact, that except in cities, the hospitals in India are situated at great distances from one another and that great time is taken to journey from one to the other. Even then to visit and inspect 100 hospitals, Miss Mayo would require 50 days.

Miss Mayo again boasts of having visited bazaars, inner chambers of Indian families, village councils, temples &c. Let us take it that all these number about 200 places. The visit was not a mere, nominal visit. She talked and conversed and discussed, she asked questions and acquired new information. It is difficult to think that an individual can ordinarily make more than four visits of such a character in a day. This part of her activity would then take at least 50 days of her journey in India.

Then again, she interviewed numerous persons in India, officials of public health, teachers and doctors, and even found *private* opportunity to question eminent Indians, "princes, politicians, administrators, religious leaders". For this again she should require at least another 50 days.

There are many other directions mentioned by her along which she says she carried out investigations; but we leave them out of account. Thus even supposing that she was given everywhere the promptest and fullest assistance necessary for the purpose, it was nothing but a sheer impossibility to accomplish the task within the time she allotted to herself.

The result is that her book from beginning to end is a compendium of things which are by no means true, of observations which are altogether wrong, of remarks which are altogether unwarranted. Where even the facts stated are true to a certain degree, they are so twisted as to appear grotesque. The only thing that is noticeable about the book is the full play given to imagination and the picturesque nature of the writing for which a certain type of American journalists are "notoriously famous."

If an Indian, after observing that kissing in public and free association between men and women are allowed in English society, were to draw the conclusion that English people form a very licentious society given entirely to sensual pleasures and their women are habitually unchaste, then that conclusion would appear to be less correct than the one drawn by Miss Mayo from the wholly superficial observations she has made in India.

By the way, may we ask Miss Mayo, why, if she were really in search of truth, she did not consult Mr. Gandhi or Dr. Rabindranath Tagore



on many of the points she has brought out? She boasts of having interviewed many notables and personalities though she does not mention all these names. Where she has mentioned names, they have been recognised as very small persons in India, and a good number of these have repudiated her statements, clearly remarking that Miss Mayo has put wholly misleading sentiments and views in their mouths.

But apart from this, is it not queer that she did not consult the two greatest personalities in India, Mr. Gandhi and Dr. Rabindranath? and while she avoids consulting them, she takes particular care to put into their mouths things which they never said and sentiments which they never expressed and never entertained.

Miss Mayo came here to investigate social matters. Not a single English or American gentleman who comes to India to know something of the customs of the people, has ever avoided seeing Mr. K. Natarajan, the talented Editor of the Indian Social Reformer, one who has been in complete touch with the Indian social reform movement during the last 40 years, who has studied as nobody else has studied the causes and the effects of the social evils existing among the Hindus, who in fact is a recognized authority on Hindu manners and customs. Why did Miss Mayo carefully avoid seeing him? Why did she not discuss with him all the questions which she raises



in her book, and why did she not ask for his co-operation in getting the information she desired to have, if she were really anxious to find out the truth with an open mind?

On the other hand, she even seeks the assistance of the C.I.D. people through Government officials, as it has now been authoritatively discovered. She gets much of her information from such people about all sorts of things, religion, philosophy and Hindu sciences, and she builds her superstructure on information thus gathered.

In short, Miss Mayo never approached the right men. In a way she was afraid of approaching them for fear of her own preconceived hypothesis, which she cherished even before she reached India, going wrong. Then as regards the information she claims to have collected, we have shown above how it could not but be superficial. And lastly she has added to it her own gossip and utilised her powers of picturesque writing to draw an ugly picture, which is wholly untrue and which she knows to be untrue if she is not deceiving herself. Wrong sources of information, the acceptance of superficial talk, gossip and hearsay as gospel truth and a plentiful pouring into it the black colour of her heart to make the picture dark and ugly, these have been the three main elements that have gone into the making of "Mother India" and have rendered it the wickedest book that was ever written in the world.

## CHAPTER IV

### **Good, Bad or Indifferent.**

“The British administration of India ” says Miss Mayo, “be it good bad or indifferent, has nothing whatever to do with the conditions above indicated. Inertia, helplessness, lack of initiative and originality, lack of staying power and sustained loyalties, sterility of enthusiasm, weakness of life-vigour itself—all are traits that truly characterize the Indian not only of to-day but of long past history.”

Let us for the purpose of argument suppose that every bad trait ascribed to the Indian does really exist in him and that too to the same extreme degree to which she wants her readers to believe it exists; but how can she say that a Government which controls the destinies of the people of India cannot influence the traits in any manner? Is Miss Mayo's conception of Governmental activity and influence so narrow, in spite of her being an “intelligent” citizen of a civilized country as the United States of America?

Even the man in the street would say that if Government are *good*, and are devotedly working for the improvement of the people entrusted to their care, they can achieve much in the way of reform, social, political and moral. Look at Japan. There

were a few people at the head of Government in that country who were wise enough to see ahead about 75 years ago and they by adjusting and extending their administrative machinery and importing into it a live spirit of rapid progress, effected a change in the very mentality of the whole nation and it was mostly owing to their efforts that Japan evolved itself in the course of three decades into a highly civilized modern nation and a first class power, of which the United States are getting increasingly jealous. That is what happens where Government are good.

Where the Government are bad or indifferent, the people would remain in the same degraded position in which they once existed. The British administration in India has functioned for the last 150 years, and yet by Miss Mayo's own evidence, the people have shown no progress. What conclusion would a reasonable man draw from this? It is that the British Government of India has been either *bad* or *indifferent*. Most of the Western social workers in India have repeatedly expressed the view that British administration is *indifferent*, because they find that all that the British care for in India is the maintenance and increase of their trade and the maintenance of their political power. All energies and activities are bent to this one goal of British rule in India. Even Mr. Mayhew in his recent work on "Education in India", states frankly that the British Government has been entirely indifferent to the social improvement of the masses.

We shall deal with this question later on in some detail. At present let the reader note that Government are the most important agency for improving the moral, social and political traits of a people, if they direct the administration unceasingly to these ends. It is impossible that a Government can remain *good, bad or indifferent* especially in a centralized administration, without its corresponding effect on the people governed. Surely, Government exists for the people. It is funny that Miss Mayo displays such pitiful ignorance of the very connection that exists between Government's administration and the improvement of the masses. Or is this the artful method of exonerating the British Government of India of all their responsibility for the improvement and reform of the people of India ?

Let us now proceed further. It is Miss Mayo's contention that "inertia, helplessness, lack of initiative &c." are ingrained in the Indian race, and that they characterise an Indian "not of to-day but of long past history."

Leaving aside to-day, let us talk of long past history. We have already quoted Max Muller and Col. Tod in Chapter II to show how in the past the Hindus were the most enterprising people in the world. We can give hundreds of quotations bearing on this point from renowned Western Scholars who have studied thoroughly the past history of the

Hindus, but we refrain from doing so for want of space. Recent researches have brought to light that the Hindus were a great colonising race who emigrated to far-off places and built colonies there. In Java, Madagaskar and Sumatra there still exists a large Hindu population.

The ancient Hindus were also a highly enterprising people in the domain of trade, commerce and industry. Their mercantile marine as Dr. R. Muckerjee, the well-known Oriental scholar, has shown was second-to-none in the world. Their ships travelled in all parts of the then known world. They braved the seas and curbed the waves.

As an industrial country, India was triumphant until two centuries ago. She supplied almost the whole of Europe including the British Isles with her own cotton and silk manufactures. Similarly, the enterprise of the Native Rulers in excavating gigantic canals and providing irrigation works for the good of their people, had progressed uninterrupted for centuries. Thus, not only in philosophy, law, astronomy and other sciences and the arts, but in the building of Empires, in colonisation, in trade, commerce and industry, the Indians of the "*long-past history*" not only held their own, but excelled every other nation in the world.

If the old enterprising spirit, if the original power of initiative does not exist to-day to the same extent that it did in the past, it is because India during

the last 1000 years has come under foreign domination. Foreign rule necessarily cramps the spirit of a people, crushes life out of them, leaves them no scope for the exercise of their natural powers, and affords no opportunities for the development of their manhood.

It may be asked, "How did India come under foreign rule?" The causes are various. It may be that the refinement of civilization and arts necessarily brought with it some deterioration in the martial spirit. The explanation of such a phenomenon can be had by comparison with what happened to the Roman Empire and how it crumbled down and perished under the brutal strokes of the hordes from the North.

When a people get too refined in civilization, their military strength usually gets low, and the uncivilized countries who naturally possess greater brutal vigour very easily conquer them. An Englishman for example would never admit that a German is their superior in civilization but if the latter displayed greater physical strength and martial valour, as he certainly did in the last war, the Englishman simply passes the remark that the Germans are superior to him only in brutal strength. Suppose the English people had lost the last war, suppose the great Indian Army which reached the front in the nick of time and was sacrificed almost to a man to the starting dash and fury of the Germans,



was not there to hold back and delay the German onslaught till due preparations were ready in England and France, suppose England had not been saved then by the Indian Army (Englishmen are most ungrateful now), but had fallen a victim to the German sword and had become a conquered country subject to Germans, would they think on that account that Germans are in any manner superior to them in civilization? Would they not, on the other hand, attribute their defeat to the superior brutal strength of the Germans?

So then, foreign domination demoralises a people. It saps their manhood and degrades the national character. It takes away the spirit of enterprise and initiative existing among the people and renders them helpless and hopeless. Is it any wonder that the Hindus of to-day after having been under foreign rule for one thousand years, are found in the condition in which they are to-day? The wonder rather is that inspite of all this foreign domination the Hindus still retain among them the original vigour of their race, and would under a truly national and beneficent rule, attain the high level reached by other nations in no long time.

---



## CHAPTER V

### **For Lack of Opportunity.**

In the last chapter we have discussed the general effects of foreign rule on a country and its inhabitants, and pointed out how such foreign rule for one thousand years is alone sufficient to explain the deterioration of Indian character, of which according to Miss Mayo, lack of initiative is the principal ingredient. We shall now try to show how these effects of foreign rule have been considerably accentuated under the British rule.

It is not that we feel any particular pleasure in pointing out the particular disadvantages of past British administration in India and their contribution to the development of the particular traits in Indian character; nor do we deny the advantages also that have flowed from British connection. The evolution of a reign of law though not yet perfected and an impartial administration of justice, are benefits which India has undoubtedly derived from British rule. But these advantages should not blind us to the fact that there have been disadvantages also which India has had to suffer under British rule and did not suffer under other foreign rule in the pre-British period such as the Mahomedan. These disadvantages have had a direct bearing on the character of the Indian, and it is

necessary that the Britishers in the United Kingdom and all over the Empire, and all other races and peoples of the world, should know that the development of certain undesirable traits in the Indian character is due to the manner in which British Indian administration was conducted in the past and to the object to which it was mainly directed.

The Mahomedans who conquered India stayed in this country, and themselves became the inhabitants of the place. There was no economic drain out of India on their account. They made India their home and got interested in her welfare. They promoted Indian agriculture, Indian industries, and Indian commerce and would promote Hindus to any post under them. Under the Mogul rule, the most trusted commanders were Hindus. In all the most important Mahomedan States either in the Deccan or in Southern India or in Bengal, Hindus were a trusted race, and were in high and responsible positions of the State. Thus the road was open to all the inhabitants of the country to reach the highest position short of kingship. Opportunities were thus found for the individual powers and character to develop and strengthen themselves. If the national character deteriorated, it deteriorated but slowly, there being still left opportunities to hold back that deterioration.

What happened with the advent of the British rule? A policy of complete distrust was inaugura-

ted. The greatest wrong that one country could do to another is the wholesale disarming of the people. This the British Government did in India. It appeared as if they did not desire that martial spirit should exist in India, and that the people of the country should remain weak and imbecile and always dependent on the British for their protection. No such attempt to emasculate a whole country was ever made by any foreign rule in India except the British.

Moving his resolution on the Arms Act at the Allahabad Congress in 1888, the late Sir Pherozeshah Mehta spoke against the great injustice done to the people of India by the disarming of the whole nation, and voiced his feelings in an indignant out-burst. "You cannot and ought not to emasculate a whole nation," said he.

Next, the British were foreigners in every sense of the word. They could not and cannot settle in India as the Mohomedans did. They could not and cannot regard India as their home as the Mohomedans did. They were out and out foreigners whose main business in life has been to preserve order, maintain their own interests, strengthen the power of their rule, make money and return to England. What interest had they in promoting the welfare of the people?

Thirdly, under the British rule, the Indians could not hope to get appointed to responsible posi-

tions. It is only recently, after 150 years of British rule, after constant agitation and bitter controversy that some beginning is being made in this direction.

But barring this recent advance, British rule has been sterile in producing a single Indian administrator of any great fame. The reason was obvious enough. No Indian was ever appointed in any responsible position. Even for the best men amongst Indians, only the subordinate positions were reserved. In the Indian Native States on the other hand, because responsible positions were open to Indians, men like the late Sir T. Madhav Rao, Diwan Bahadur Raghunath Rao, Sir Sheshadri Aiyar, Sir Salar Jung made their appearance as great administrators of whom India will ever remain proud.

The fact is that you can never hope to develop the highest latent powers in you unless under circumstances of great responsibility. Such opportunities have been denied to Indians under British rule. So late as 1905, the late Mr. Gokhale in his budget speech complained :—

“When all positions of power and of official trust and responsibility are the virtual monopoly of a class (European), those who are outside that class are constantly weighed down with a sense of their own inferior position, and the tallest of them have no option but to bend in order that the exigencies of the situation may be satisfied.”

Those who know the history of Morley-Minto reforms of 1909, will remember what a strong opposition Lord Morley had to put up with in carrying out his proposals to appoint one Indian Member in each of the Executive Councils in India. Lord Morley's letters to Lord Minto published in his *Recollections* Vol. 2 are eloquent on this matter. In one of these letters, knowing well the sentiment among Civilians and Anglo-Indians in India, Lord Morley remarks somewhat sarcastically:—"I suppose the notion of a Native in your Executive Council would not do at all. Is that certain? I dare say it is and it would frighten that nervous personage (naturally nervous) the Anglo-Indian!" In another letter he observes in regard to the feeling on the matter in England:—"The Native Member is still a fashionable stumbling block. He is at the back of all their minds even when they are talking of things that have nothing at all to do with it."

It is a well-known fact that His Majesty himself was opposed to the proposal and was trying to intervene. Even Lord Ripon the great benefactor of India and a great advocate of Indian interests, felt sceptical. This shows what deep distrust existed in the best British minds until twenty years ago, about even the best and most loyal Indians. The great apprehension entertained was that Government secrets would be out. Lord Morley's unbending attitude and the great prestige he had in the Cabinet and the Parliament carried the day.

More than anything else, British rule in India has sapped the economic life of the country and contributed to the poverty of her people. Let us remember that we are talking of the past and not of the present. India, as is well known, was until two centuries ago, a great industrial country, which supplied Great Britain and the Continent with her textile manufactures. If the British rulers had settled here permanently and formed part of the Indian population as the Mohomedans did, with the same economic interests as Indians had, the industries of the country would not have perished under the blighting influence of British trade interests.

See what the British Government did in England and in India in regard to Indian industries. Having won political control over India, the British Government in England thought that India could be turned into a highly profitable market for their own manufactures. But conditions were against them. For Indian manufactures were so artistic and also cheap that even in England, they competed very favourably with English goods. The Englishman then thought of the device of a high tariff wall against Indian goods, and levied it to shut out Indian manufactures from his country.

The historian of India Prof. H. H. Wilson thus describes the whole episode:—

“It is also a melancholy instance of the wrong done to India by the country on which she has



become dependent. It was stated in evidence (in 1813) that the cotton and silk goods of India up to the period could be sold for a profit in the British market at a price from 50 to 60 per cent lower than those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of 70 and 80 per cent. on their value or by positive prohibition. Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitive duties and decrees existed, the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped in their outset and could scarcely have been again set in motion, even by the power of steam. They were created by the sacrifice of the Indian manufacture. Had India been independent, she would have retaliated, would have imposed prohibitive duties upon British goods, and would thus have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self-defence was not permitted her; she was at the mercy of the stranger. British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms."

As Henry St. George Tucker then observed, "India was thus reduced from the state of manufacturing to that of an agricultural country."

Mr. Montgomery Martin in his *Eastern India* (Vol. III. Introduction) published in London 1838,



exposed the whole British policy then in the following very pungent words:—

“Under the pretence of Free Trade, England has compelled the Hindus to receive the products of the steam looms of Lancashire, Yorkshire, Glasgow &c., at mere nominal duties; while the hand-wrought manufactures of Bengal and Behar, beautiful in fabric and durable in wear, have had heavy and almost prohibitive duties imposed on their importation to England.”

But the British servants of the East India Company in India worked even greater havoc than this by their inhuman treatment of the Indian manufacturers. It is a well-known and oft-repeated story that some manufacturers of Dacca muslins had their fingers cut off by British people in India as a penalty for their skill. Similarly, almost all weavers in the country were held in subjection by a system of advances, from which they could never hope to disentangle themselves. Regulations were passed placing various restrictions on the weavers, one of which was that “weavers possessed of more than one loom, and entertaining one or more workmen, shall be subject to a penalty of 35 per cent on the stipulated price of every piece of cloth.”

Even after Dr. Buchanan’s economic inquiries in Northern India carried out under special instructions from Government brought to light the very pitiable state of the Indian industries, no

effective steps were taken in England or in India to benefit the sufferers. "On the contrary" writes Mr. Montgomery Martin, the author quoted above, "we have done everything possible to impoverish still further the miserable beings subject to the cruel selfishness of English commerce."

Those who want to get more and detailed information on this aspect of past British Indian administration should read the "Economic History of British India" by the late Mr. R. C. Dutt, I. C. S., C. I. E., who after a chequered career as an administrator was appointed Lecturer in Indian History at University College, London.

Surely, if the Britishers had settled in India as the Mohomedans did, they would have tried to promote the industries of the country and protect them against foreign competition, instead of taking active steps to kill them as they actually did with a view to promote the sale of their own country's manufactures among the Indian people. This has been the special effect of past British administration on Indian economic conditions which the foreign domination of Mohomedans had not.

It may be said that the early invasions of Mohomedans carried away much booty with them and even under the later Moghul rule, Nadirshah is said to have carried away vast stores of Indian wealth. Let the whole of the contention be granted. Will all the wealth thus carried away amount to a

hundredth part of the Indian wealth carried away by East India Company's servants in the early days of the Company's rule ?

Read the following vivid picture by Lord Macaulay in his essay on "Lord Clive" :—

"The Roman proconsul, who in a year or two, squeezed out of a province the means of rearing marble palaces and baths on the shores of Campania, of drinking from amber, of feasting on singing bird, of exhibiting armies of gladiators and flocks of camelopards, the Spanish viceroy, who leaving behind him the curses of Mexico or Lima, entered Madrid with a long train of gilded coaches and the sumptor-horses trapped and shod with silver, *were now out-done*. Cruelty indeed properly so called, was not among the vices of the servants of the Company. But cruelty itself could hardly have produced greater evils than sprang from their unprincipled eagerness to be rich."

The means and methods followed by these servants of the Company in their unprincipled eagerness to be rich are then described as follows :—

"The servants of the Company obtained not for their employers but for themselves, a monopoly of almost the whole internal trade. They forced the natives to buy dear and to sell cheap. They insulted with impunity the tribunals, the police, and the fiscal authorities of the country. They covered with

their protection a set of native dependents who ranged through the provinces, spreading desolation and terror wherever they appeared. Every servant of a British factory was armed with all the power of his master, and his master was armed with all the power of the Company. *Enormous fortunes were thus rapidly accumulated at Calcutta, while thirty millions of human beings were reduced to the extremity of wretchedness.*"

Lord Macaulay then points out the peculiar nature of British tyranny as compared with the tyranny of native rule. He observes:—

"They had been accustomed to live under tyranny but never under tyranny like this. They found the little finger of the Company thicker than the loins of Surajah Dowlah. Under these old masters they had at least one resource when the evil became unsupportable, the people rose and pulled down the Government. But the English Government was not to be so shaken off. That Government, oppressive as the most oppressive form of barbarian despotism, was strong with all the strength of civilization. It resembled the government of evil Genii rather than the government of human tyrants."

Let this pass. What of the unceasing economic drain on India during the last hundred years or more, a drain which the late Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji struggled in vain for years to stop?

“Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the state and the government of India under its Native Rulers,” says Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji on page 579 of his ‘Poverty and Un-British rule in India’, “one thing is certain that the greatest evil of the present un-British system of British rule in India did not exist under the Native Rulers *viz.* the unceasing and ever-increasing ‘bleeding’ and drain of India by the ‘evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion’ (Sir John Shore 1787), and by inflicting upon India every burden of expenditure incurred even for the interests of Britain itself. This evil is further aggravated by what Lord Salisbury calls ‘political hypocrisy’ or by what Lord Lytton calls ‘deliberate and transparent subterfuges,’ producing what Lord Salisbury calls ‘terrible misery’ or what Lord Cromer calls ‘extreme poverty,’ or what Lord Lawrence described as ‘that the mass of the people live on scanty subsistence.’ ”

About a hundred years ago (1838) Mr. Montgomery Martin wrote in *Eastern India* (Vol. I):—

“The annual drain of £3 million on British India has amounted in 30 years, at 12 per cent. (the usual Indian rate) compound interest, to the enormous sum of £723,900,000, sterling. So constant and accumulating a drain, even in England, would soon impoverish her. How severe then must be its effects on India, where the wage of a labourer is from two pence to three pence a day ?”



Commenting on this, Dr. Dadabhai said:—  
 “What then must be the condition now when the drain is getting perhaps ten times larger, and a larger amount besides is eaten in the country itself by others than the people. Even an ocean would be dried up if a portion of its evaporation did not always return to it as rain or river. If interest were added to the drain, what enormous loss would it be?”

Sir George Wingate, an honoured name in the Bombay presidency, who has left his mark on the land revenue settlement in that province, described the effects of this drain on India in “Our Financial Relations with India” published in 1859, in the following words :—

“With reference to its economical effects upon the condition of India, the tribute paid to Great Britain is by far the most objectionable feature in our existing policy. Taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effects from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former case the taxes collected from the population at large are paid away to the portion of the population engaged in the service of Government, through whose expenditure they are again returned to the industrious classes. They occasion a different distribution but no loss of national income.

“But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they



are raised. In this case, they constitute no more transfer of a portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country. As regards its effects on national production, the whole amount might as well be thrown into the sea as transferred to another country, for no portion of it will return from the latter to the taxed country in any shape whatsoever. Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India."

Then again it is the British rule, that has legalised drinking and made it into a source of revenue. Both under Hindu rule and Mahomedan rule, drinking was condemned, and it was known only in the dark corners of the country. Under the British rule, the vice has been flourishing exceedingly and under the most favourable circumstances, and to-day the position is so embarrassing that to introduce prohibition has been rendered practically impossible by reason of the great difficulty of making good the deficit in revenue. The people of India have thus been demoralised by reason of the spread of drinking under the British rule, and God only knows when it would become practicable to put a stop to this demoralization.

In these several ways, the British domination of India has affected the people and their interests. They are a disarmed people who lose their martial

valour and physical courage day by day. They are a people to whom all responsible positions were long denied and whose powers of administration were not given any scope for development. They are a people whose industries were killed by prohibitive tariffs in England and active inhuman steps in India. They are a people whose poverty is mainly due to the enormous fortunes made by the British under the East India Company by tyrannous and cruel methods and to the unceasing economic drain on India that still continues. They are a people to whom drinking was practically unknown under pre-British rule but among whom drinking prevails to-day as a general vice.

Consider all these evils of British rule in India and will you ask why the Indian politician asks for self-rule? Consider the general effect of these evils on national character and will you ask why the Indian character has deteriorated, why he shows want of enterprise and lack of initiative, why he has been rendered dull and sick and inert?

Let us repeat that, it is with the greatest reluctance that we have had to unearth these inglorious chapters in the history of the British administration in India. Far be it from us to humiliate thereby the British people. It is not our object to remind them wantonly of the mis-deeds and shameful conduct of their ancestors in regard to India. But Miss Mayo, herself ignorant of Indian history, challenges us

in spite of her ignorance and thereby hopes to carry the day with the world at large. It behoves every one of us in these circumstances, to speak out the truth to the world.

Miss Mayo has had the audacity of saying that the British Government, good, bad or indifferent, has nothing whatever to do with the conditions as they exist to-day in India. After reading this chapter, will she dare say it again ?

---

## CHAPTER VI

### **More Political than Social.**

In the last two chapters, we saw what effect the evils of foreign domination in India have had on the Indian national character and how inertia, want of enterprise, lack of initiative and such other traits which Miss Mayo points out as characteristic of the Indian, can be traced to its blighting influence. Miss Mayo's contention therefore that the British administration in India, good, bad, or indifferent, has had nothing to do with these undesirable traits in the Indian, has thus been smashed to pieces.

Miss Mayo next argues that the existence of certain social evils in Indian society is responsible for the undesirable traits in Indian character. It is not our purpose to argue that social evils that exist among Hindus, as they exist in every other society be it English or American, have no influence at all on the character of the Indian. In fact they do influence Indian character to a considerable extent, but they come in secondarily and the principal and the all-embracing cause is the blighting influence of foreign rule.

It should not be supposed that Indian leaders are unmindful of these social evils. Every Indian politician as every Indian social reformer knows

that there are many social evils which require to be removed and their attempts in that direction have never been slack. But when the existence of these social evils is cited as an excuse against India's political advance, then we cannot but join issue with those who are foremost in putting forward this plea. Miss Mayo's whole book is a long-drawn argument against giving India more political powers. The sum and substance of her long contention is that Indians should apply their mind and energy to the removal of their social evils and to the general introduction of social reform among all classes and grades of society and that until the social revolution is complete they should not demand more political powers.

Gratuitous advice of this kind, Indians have been used to receive since the Indian National Congress was started. But the late lamented Mr. Hume, the founder of the Indian National Congress, and the late Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji than whom India has produced no purer, greater, and more thoughtful patriot in recent years, both decided that the business of the Congress should be mainly political. At the same time they did not neglect the social side, and by practical work among the people and by holding social conferences they demonstrated their zeal for social reform also.

The attitude of the Congress then and the importance given by it to political reform, formed the subject of strong criticism by Sir Auckland Colvin in

the eighties of the last century. Even so late as in 1910, Sir Valentine Chirol in his "Indian Unrest" deplored the attitude of the Congress and thought that the Congress was working in the wrong direction in asking for political reform instead of working entirely for social reform. Sir Valentine has recently changed his opinion and in his latest publication favours India's political progress.

That Englishmen should always give us such advice, namely, that we should never work for political reform so long as social reform is not completely effected in our society, is but natural and we know and the world knows that it is interested advice. But when an American lady, a citizen of the United States of America, is out to put us right as she claims to do in the guise of disinterestedness, it is necessary for us to tell her and all the world what exactly our position is.

It is proposed therefore to show here conclusively that social reform need not necessarily precede political reform in a people's progress, and secondly that as the British administration in India by its apathy towards social reform and legislation has shown itself incapable of effecting social reform in the society, it is time that larger political powers are entrusted to Indians themselves so that they may use these powers to speedily bring about social reform among them.

"Should social reform precede political reform in India?" was the subject of a highly instructive



address that the late Mr. Justice Telang delivered in Bombay in 1886, and Mr. Telang clearly proved therein that in most societies political reform has actually preceded social reform. He also showed how the spirit of progress working in the political sphere always manifests itself in greater or less vigour in the social sphere ; therefore, in fact, social progress and political progress are by no means two water-tight compartments. To support this argument, Mr. Telang quoted from Mr. Herbert Spencer's essay on "Manners and Fashions" the following apt observation:—

"Submission whether to Government, to the dogmas of ecclesiastics, or to that code of behaviour which society at large has set up, is essentially of the same nature; and the sentiment which induces resistance to the despotism of rulers, civil or spiritual, likewise induces resistance to the despotism of the world's opinion."

Mr. Telang then proceeds to give historical evidence for this argument. The rise and the growth of the Maratha Empire in India was undoubtedly a great and brilliant political achievement of the Hindus, and yet what was the social condition of the Hindus at the period? After reading all the chronicles of those times, Mr. Telang thought that the social condition of that period was not very much superior to the social condition that is now prevailing. "We had then infant marriage and en-

forced widowhood ; we had imperfect female education ; we had also the practice of Sati, though that never was a very wide-spread practice.”

Then again, if we go back to a still earlier period in Indian history, we have evidence in the writings of that famous Chinese traveller, Hiouen Tsang who came to this country in the seventh century A. D., of a prosperous political condition, while the facts of the social condition do not indicate any very great superiority over what prevails now. “The caste system was then in force, and we have it expressly and distinctly stated by Hiouen Tsang that in those days widow marriage was not practised.”

Mr. Telang would go even further and point out instances from the English history itself. As an instance he would take the political history of England in the seventeenth century. “The beginning of the century synchronises with the close of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, in whose time, after a pretty long period of enjoyment by the crown of almost uncontrolled power, the rights and privileges of the people had begun to be asserted.” Then again in the reign of Charles I “you have the achievements of that brilliant galaxy of political workers, containing Hampden, the five Members, the great men of the Long Parliament.”

We pass on then to the Protectorate of Cromwell, a tangible embodiment of the assertion of popular power against the Crown. Then, we come

after the Restoration to the well-known Habeas Corpus Act. And after the short and inglorious reign of James II, we come to the Great Revolution of 1688. Then we have the Declaration of Rights and Bill of Rights till finally we reach the Act of Settlement at the very close of the seventeenth century.

“It would not be easy, I should say,” said Mr. Telang, “to find out in history many parallels to the course of political progress indicated by the events I have now alluded to,—a course which not merely improved the condition of England at the time, but has been followed up by greater or less progress of a similarly salutary character since and is being still so followed up in our own day.”

Such being the political progress during the century, what was the social condition of England during the period? One has only to read the third chapter of Lord Macaulay’s history of England, to know what the social condition of the English Society then was. “The condition of the working classes and the agriculturists, the state of the means of communication, the extra-ordinary extent to which children were over-worked for the benefit, in the result, of the adult population, the looseness and obscenity of general conversation, these are all dwelt on in the interesting pages of Macaulay.”

In regard to the miserable state of female education in about that period, Macaulay gives merely

as an instance of what was only too common at the time, the ignorance of such a person as Queen Mary, the wife of William III, her ignorance of her own vernacular, the classical language being shown in a sentence endorsed by Queen Mary herself on a copy of a book, Bible, presented to her. "This book" so runs the endorsement, "was given the King and I at our coronation."

Lord Macaulay also states that in those days, husbands of "decent station" were not ashamed of cruelly beating their wives. "Thus at the politically glorious epoch in England's history, the social condition in regard to the relations of the sexes was by no means of a highly creditable character."

The lesson that Mr. Telang drew from these instances in history and even from the contemporary history of England in his days which also he discussed in his famous address, was that, "political progress can be achieved and is being achieved before our eyes, where social evils still remain unremedied, and where they receive but a comparatively small fraction of the attention and reforming energy of the people."

If such is a true state of things, there is no reason in saying that India can be fit for political reform only when all her social evils are remedied. Both social reform and political reform can proceed simultaneously. This is in fact the line followed by

all Indian leaders. They do not concentrate their energy on political reform or social reform only, though the press for obvious reasons gives more publicity to political activities.

Even then, there would appear to be a case for giving precedence to political reform. This, for two reasons. If political reform is secured by the concerted action of all the educated classes in India that must, and inevitably will, tell favourably on the advancement of social reform. As Sir Henry Cotton some time Governor of Assam remarked in his book on "New India", "bereft of political independence, their ideas of collective action cannot have that impress of sound logic and morality which collective action alone can impart to them. A considerable degree of thought and action has lately been established in political matters and it may be hoped, therefore, that there will shortly be a similar manifestation in regard to moral and social questions."

The second reason is this. It is plainly a maxim of prudence and common sense that reform ought to go along the line of least resistance. "Secure first the reform which you can secure with the least difficulty and then turn your energies in the direction of those reforms where more difficulty has to be encountered." You will thus obtain all that vigour which the spirit of reform must derive from success, and thus carry out the whole work of

progress with greater promptitude than if you go to work the other way."

Now as Mr. Telang pointed out, "in politics argument goes a great way; in social reform it goes for very little, seeing that feeling and tradition are involved in it to a very large extent indeed." Similarly in politics we can all unite at once, Hindus, Musalmans, Parsis, people of Eastern India, Southern India, Western India, Northern India. The evils or supposed evils are common; the remedies not being in any way mixed with any very powerful traditions, are also the same; and all intelligent Indian opinion is necessarily unanimous. In regard to social matters, however, the conditions are all altered. "The evils for one thing are not identical. The surrounding conditions are excessively various. The force of traditions and old memories is not equal all round. And the remedies, therefore, that suggest themselves to different minds are almost of necessity different."

From the foregoing, it will appear that the cry that social reform should precede political reform in India is an interested cry and is heard most when some political advance is due as at the present time. It has no historic foundation whatsoever. On the other hand, history justifies the precedence of political reform over social reform.

---



## CHAPTER VII

### **Safety First ?**

We have so far dealt with only one of the two questions proposed to be discussed in the last chapter. We shall now discuss the other question. Our argument in brief is that we want political power to effect social reform. It may be asked, "Cannot the British administration in India utilise its political power to effect social reform?" To this our answer is an emphatic "No". It may again be asked, "Cannot you effect social reform without the aid of law and legislation?" To this again, our answer is another emphatic "No". Therefore, the only way out of our social difficulties is to entrust us with larger political powers, so that we can utilise them to our social ends.

The British Government being a foreign Government in India are not in the first place interested in the social advancement of the people. If any legislation for social reform is necessary, even if there be a large demand for it from the people, the Government get nervous. They fear that their active participation in socio-religious reform might cause discontent among the orthodox people and to some extent endanger the safety of British rule. That this fear is groundless we are convinced, but even then it should be granted that it is natural for a foreign Government to entertain such fear.

It wasn't so and it would not be so under Indian rule. Sir H. Maine, the renowned Jurist, who was for some time Law-Member of the Government of India, has pointed out in regard to the Hindu Law as administered by the British Indian Courts, that "it has now assumed a stiffness, rigidity and inflexibility, which formed no feature of the system before British rule." What a foreign Government fear to do, the Indian Government can easily do. For in the latter case, the social reform introduced by the power of the law does not appear to the people as a reform forced on them. In the days of the Peshwa *regime* for instance, in the Maratha country, as the late Mr. Justice Telang the most accomplished student of Maratha history if ever there was one, has pointed out, there was a liberalising process going on and "if the Peshwa rule had continued a little longer, several of the social reforms which are now giving us and the British Government so much trouble would have been secured with immensely greater ease."

Even in present times, the Indian States especially the larger ones, are decidedly superior to the British Provinces in the matter of taking measures for social reform. Take Mysore and Baroda for example. In Mysore, a number of social reforms have been introduced by Government even by mere executive action. The Indian rulers do not feel any nervousness in taking such action. They seem to know by instinct the needs of the people. The only difficulty

with them is that most of them are ease-loving, pleasure-hunting people, with an inadequate idea of their responsibility.

As against this, the British Government affords little help to social progress. Undoubtedly the introduction of western education in India has contributed much to the awakening of the social conscience of Indians, and the Christian activities in India have contributed no less. But apart from this, the British Government has achieved little directly in the matter of social reform. In a sense their position is understandable. They are a foreign Government and are naturally afraid in putting their hand deep in the social affairs of society, the safety of their rule being their first consideration. That such nervousness is certainly unjustifiable is another matter.

While they are not particularly interested in bringing about social reform they are particular in pointing at our social evils whenever the demand for political advance troubles them. Some of the Indian politicians have begun to think that the British Government though expressing outwardly profuse sympathies with the attempts of the social reformers, do not really wish that the social evils should be removed, for if they are removed, their one great argument behind which they are always taking shelter against the Indian demand for political rights, will disappear, and the *raison d'être* of British rule will to that extent be weakened.

It may be said that some measures of social reform have actually been carried out under British rule. Sati has been abolished, widow-remarriage has been legalised, the Age of Consent Act was passed, &c. &c. But this is all the record of social legislation under the British administration of more than hundred years past. And secondly, every one of these measures of reform has been carried out after intense agitation by Indian social reformers. On every occasion, the British Government was not only nervous but even appeared to oppose the reform. But a galaxy of social reformers in India, appearing in a connected and uninterrupted line of succession from the great Raja Ram Mohan Roy downwards, men of intense enthusiasm, of unbounded energy and unfaltering faith, men like Ishwar Chandra Vidya-sagar, Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar and Mr. Justice Ranade, were after the British Government, appealing to their conscience and giving them a new idea of their mission in India, and it was because these our own leaders toiled and toiled hard for the social deliverance of the people that some advance could be made. And what an immense labour it cost them! Greater achievements with the same labour could have been made under Indian rule. And besides, British Government left to itself would have done nothing in that direction.

What is the position of social reform under British Rule to-day? The Britishers of their own accord would not introduce any measure. Suppose

some enlightened members of the legislature either in the Central Assembly or in the Provincial Councils introduce certain measures by way of bills to remove particular social evils; the practice with Government is first to ridicule the idea, but when they find that their ridicule serves no purpose, they try to put as many hindrances as possible in the way of the measure passing the legislature, on the ground that public opinion is not behind it.

The Anglo-Indian press which is very strong in the country, and greatly influences Government always supports Government and from its ingenious brains invents various arguments not directly against the reforming measure, but to delay it, mostly on the ground that the masses are not prepared for it, as if it alone knows the mind of the masses best. This is the very press which in season and out of season does not scruple to point at the existence of our social evils as the argument against political advance.

The most recent instance of such behaviour on the part of Government as well as on the part of the Anglo-Indian press is connected with the non-official Bill introduced in the Assembly by Rai Saheb Harbilas Sarda to raise the marriageable age of boys and girls among the Hindus by penalising marriage below certain ages, 14 for girls and 18 for boys. The whole of enlightened opinion in the country has supported this measure. Yet Government



would put all sorts of delays in its passing, and the Anglo-Indian press throughout the country, even the "Times of India", on one pretext or other supported the Government while the Indian press, extremist, nationalist, moderate and even pro-Government otherwise, demands speedily the passing of the Bill. What conclusion can one draw from such conduct on the part of Government and the Anglo-Indian press? We have stated only one instance and that the most recent. But many such instances can easily be pointed out.

It may be that, as a general rule, it is safer to base law on public opinion. But in social reform, it is the enlightened public opinion alone that is of value. And besides when the Assembly which represents the country supports a measure, where is the need of again referring it to the masses? Are there not also cases in which legislation is and ought to be in advance of public opinion? Surely if Government instead of being guided by the opinion of the Indian social reformers, had thought of consulting public opinion among the masses before abolishing the *Sati*, we wonder if *Sati* would have been abolished even by this time.

Even in England, in many cases, reform by legislation has gone ahead of public opinion. One has only to read Prof. A. V. Dicey's 'Law and Public Opinion' to get convinced on this point. According to Prof. Dicey, many measures of social



reform were carried out through Parliament not only without consulting the masses but even sometimes in opposition to mass opinion and that the passing of the law in such cases has been instrumental in creating a favourable public opinion for the reform itself and enlightening the conscience of the masses.

On the whole, the British Government in India is ordinarily averse to undertake social legislation, and Indian reformers have after sufficient experience of the past have come to be convinced that there is a limit under present administration to the usefulness of their activities in social reform. Therefore, though these social reformers had until recently kept themselves ordinarily aloof from political agitation, they now demand along with the politicians larger political powers in their hands to bring about social reform as early as possible. Even the late Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, the eminent Social Reformer of Western India, who was extremely conservative in politics, finally came round to this view.

Thus, when Miss Mayo emphatically declares that "no agency but a new spirit within his own breast" can set the Indian free, she is perfectly right. Only we mean it in one sense, she means it in another. She starts with the wrong assumption that Indian reformers do not put forward any individual or collective efforts at all and that social reform can be furthered without the aid of Governmental action. We say that our social reformers have tried and are

trying all they can individually and collectively to bring about speedy reform in Hindu society. But they have not reached the end of their resources. They find that without Governmental action the further pace of social reform is bound to be slow. The British administration of India as at present constituted is not helpful to speedy reform and therefore the political rights of the people themselves should be enhanced so that they may be utilised in the direction of removing our social evils.

---

## CHAPTER VIII

### **The Myth Exploded.**

“Before British rule commenced in India, there was chaos in the land. The British people rescued India from this anarchy and brought order out of chaos.” Such is the view which has been long current in India and in England and which has been and is being sedulously propagated throughout the world.

Every body seems to take this view for granted. Nobody questions it. The view seems to have been transformed into acceptable truth by its long currency and especially because nobody has taken any care to seriously question it. Perhaps it was thought, that the discussion was of mere academic interest. Besides, nobody had any idea that the British Government would artfully propagate this view as a true fact of history for the world's consumption but against India's interest.

Miss Mayo, as every other British or foreign writer, assumes the correctness of this view and bases all sorts of conclusions on this assumption. If the disadvantages of the British rule are pointed out, to off-set them, it is claimed and declared from the house-tops that Indians forget the greatest good ever done to India, namely that they have been rescued

by the British from anarchy. This statement is so often repeated in Miss Mayo's book, so often dinned in fact into the ears of her readers, that it seems as if it is a self-evident truth to ordinary minds.

It is time that once for all this myth is exploded, first in the interest of truth and secondly because British politicians are always taking advantage of it with great success whenever we press our political demands hard on the attention of Parliament.

Was there really anarchy in India before British rule, and did the British people rescue us from it? The school text book of Indian history will say "yes" to this. These school books have been written by British educational administrators for consumption by Indian school children, in which the British people are always described as the angels and whoever opposed them and fought against them were demons. Such teaching of history in Indian schools is designed for the purpose of inculcating in the minds of Indians when they are very young, a view about British people which the Government desire the Indian people to hold. It has been considered not without reason, that the teaching of history in the schools on these lines will always keep the Indian a loyal and obedient creature.

Apart from this direct attempt to manufacture loyalty to the British Crown among the people of India, it is certainly unfortunate that history in

India has been written for us mostly by the Europeans. This does not mean that we are not grateful to them for their attempts to give us a picture of our past. Elphinstone, Grant Duff, Malcolm and in recent days Sir Vincent Smith will always be remembered with gratitude by the Indians. So far as it was possible for them, they took care to write down the truth as it appeared to them.

Where however British historians have attempted to describe British dealings in India, even when they tried not to import conscious bias, there did appear some unconscious justification of British action. Undoubtedly in many cases, British action has been condemned but it is generally argued that on the whole and taking all things into consideration, the British people were not at fault.

The author of "The Other Side of The Medal", Mr. Edward Thompson, has exposed British writers of Indian history in one such case out of many, namely in their entirely misleading account of the Indian Mutiny of 1857.

Curiously enough, even in the pages of these very historians, you will find evidence to show that Indian Governments were well carried on in many parts of the country, that ordinarily there was peace in the land, that British people themselves entered into wars with the Indian Governments on some pretext or other and often brought about anarchy in the country, and that there was a very real

possibility of the whole country coming practically under Maratha rule, if the British power had not made its appearance.

When we say that there was anarchy in India, we must know what is exactly meant by anarchy. The fact that India was not under one rule and that there were many States ruling different parts of the country, does not mean that there was anarchy in the land. India is a vast country, a continent equal to the whole of Europe minus Russia. There are and there were several States in Europe, each administering its own territory. The absence of one rule, therefore, cannot mean anarchy.

The next point is that several of these States were often at war with one another. But a similar state of things existed in Europe. The last three centuries were practically marked by constant wars between the various States. During the 17th and 18th centuries especially, no period of even five years can be marked in European history during which it can be said Europe was free from any war. We do not say on this account that there was anarchy in Europe.

Anarchy therefore may exist only when there is no protection from Government to the people. Whether there be wars or whether there are no wars, so long as the people in a State get the protection from its Government, it is incorrect to say that there is anarchy. Small disorders here or there should not.



be counted. For even in British India to-day, there are communal riots and disorders in many parts, but we do not say that there is anarchy now on that account. The Indian North West Frontier, in spite of so many years of occupation by the British, as Mr. Rangachariar has pointed out in his minute of dissent to the N. W. F. Committee Report, is still in almost anarchic conditions. Similarly in Bombay and Calcutta, numbers of armed dacoities, take place every year even to-day under British rule. That is no indication of anarchy. Even in England in the 18th century, a compact state though it was, there were many disorders, many riots and two great insurrections—the “fifteen” and the “fortyfive”. Has anybody said that there was anarchy in England on this account? Therefore as long as the ordinary citizen gets the reasonable protection from Government, so long no anarchy can be said to exist.

Let us apply these tests to the political condition of things in India in the beginning of the 18th century. The Moghul power had come to decay, the last great Moghul Monarch Aurangzeb having died in 1707. The Marathas were asserting themselves in Central and Northern India. In the South were the Mohamedan kingdoms with the famous or notorious Nabob of Arcot. In Bengal, there was also a Mohamedan State, practically independent, but nominally subject to the Moghu Crown.

The jealousy between the French and the British which they carried from Europe to India, was the main cause that contributed to the perpetual wars between the various States. But there was no anarchy as such, even then. Only after the Marathas sustained a defeat at Panipat, there was considerable doubt as to who would possess Northern India. As Mr. Keene, the author of "Madhao Rao Scindia" in the "Rulers of India" series, observes, there were only two statesmen in India who well understood the situation, Madhao Rao Scindia and Warren Hastings and there was keen rivalry between them to possess the Hindustan. But eventually the Marathas succeeded in re-establishing their sway. The British power did not feel itself strong enough at that time to face a war with the Marathas and in fact sustained a defeat in the Maratha war.

But all along the British power was watching the country and its political situations. When Lord Wellesley appeared on the scene, he made up his mind at once to conquer all other States and bring them under British rule. What was the reason for this? There was no reason except the motive to extend British dominion throughout India. The "Subsidiary System" was introduced and pretexts were found to wage wars with States which did not adopt the system, so much so that he made it impossible for independent States to live in India.

Confirmation of this fact would be found in the state correspondence of the time, of which very excellent and correct use has been made in Major B. D. Basu's "Rise of Christian Power in India" and his other works on Indian history.

It was wholly and solely the desire of conquest that led Lord Wellesley and his successors to bring the whole of India under British rule. There was no anarchy, no chaos. Possibly, if European people had not appeared in the country, the Maratha Empire, to-day, would have spread over the whole of India. But the British and the French with their mutual hatred fought wars among themselves in India, involved the Indian States therein, and contributed largely to the instability of Governments, and finally when the French power was broken down, the British in their triumph soon learnt to checkmate the Indian States and conquered them.

The rise of British power in India was a menace to the existence of free Indian States in India.

Such being the true history of India, it is idle to say that the British rescued India from anarchy. The British power waged wars against Indian States and as the former was stronger, the latter were conquered. Suppose Germany had conquered France and retained her under German rule. From this circumstance alone, you cannot conclude that France was rescued from anarchy. One people

were conquered by another. That was all that happened in India. England was conquered by the Normans. You cannot say on that account that there was anarchy in England under Harold.

The talk of anarchy is therefore ill-directed talk. Much is made of the Pendharee hordes which overran the country. Exaggerated accounts are given of their depredations. Well, the Pendharees did do much mischief. But then, one has to bear in mind two or three considerations. In the territories of the stronger States, the Pendharees did not appear at all, because they were afraid of being easily crushed. In regard to smaller States, these paid a certain amount of money to the Pendharees whenever they appeared in their territories, or some small yearly contribution to avoid their trouble, and thereby managed to give protection to their people.

Even when nothing of this kind occurred to protect the people from the ravages of the Pendharees, the village-punchayats in each village warded off their blows or purchased immunity from their trouble by their own contributions. Thus the Pendharees, though noted for their depredations, were actually prevented from doing much actual mischief to the inhabitants of the country by a recognised system of money contributions.

It must be remembered that the Pendharee Raj was a later phenomenon and was largely the result of British conquests or at least of the disorders

caused by British wars, and the crippling of the power of the free Indian States thereby. And this trouble barely existed for more than 30 years. The Indian States left to themselves would easily have crushed the Pendharees.

We have spoken above of the village-Punchayats (small village governments). These were the self-governing units of government in India from ancient times and were the main instruments of preserving order throughout the country. Even when States fought with one another, even when the Pendharees or other hordes would overrun the country, these self-governing units, maintained their own freedom by various means. These were the real institutions that preserved India from anarchy.

Responsible British administrators in India were struck with the permanence and efficiency of the village-Punchayats as they existed before British rule uprooted them. See what Sir Charles Metcalfe, some time Governor-General of India, said about them :—

The village communities are little republics having nearly everything they can want within themselves and almost independent of any foreign nation. They seem to last where nothing else lasts. Dynasty after dynasty tumbles down, revolution succeeds revolution, and Pathan, Moghul, Mahrata, Sikh and British are all masters in turn, but the village communities remain the same. This union of village



communities, each one forming a separate little State in itself, is in a high degree conducive to their (Hindu) happiness and to the enjoyment of a great portion of freedom and independence."

Similarly Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone who was Governor of Bombay and author of an excellent History of India, in his voluminous and most instructive "Report on the Territories conquered from the Peshwas" observes as follows:—

"In whatever point of view we examine the Native Government in the Deccan, the first and most important feature is the division into villages or townships. These communities contain in miniature all the materials of a State within themselves, and are almost sufficient to protect their members, if all other Governments are withdrawn. Though probably not compatible with a very good form of government, they are an excellent remedy for the imperfections of a bad one ; they prevent the bad effects of its negligence and weakness, and even present some barrier against its tyranny and rapacity."

Then after pointing out some of the defects in Maratha rule, Mr. Elphinstone further remarks:—

"But with all these defects, the Maratha country flourished, and *the people seem to have been exempt from some of the evils which exist under our more perfect Government.* There must, therefore, have been some advantages in the system to counter-



balance its obvious defects, and most of them appear to me to have originated in one fact, that the Government, although it did little to obtain justice for the people, left them the means of procuring it for themselves. The advantage of this was particularly felt among the lower orders, who are most out of reach of their rulers, and most apt to be neglected under all governments. By means of the Panchayat, they were enabled to effect a tolerable dispensation of justice among themselves; and it happens that most of the objections above stated to that institution do not apply in their case."

From this it is very clear that as long as these village communities lasted in India and functioned efficiently, there was no fear of any evils of anarchy spreading in the country.

These village communities disappeared under British rule. The British administrators thought that there was no further need of them, and first crippled their powers and then abolished them. It was one of the unwisest acts ever done by the British in India. They have themselves now realised the unwisdom of it, and in some provinces, attempts are made to revive them. But these are half-hearted attempts as yet.

The moral that we want to drive into the minds of our readers is that the statement so often made and broadcast and accepted as an axiom, namely that the British people rescued India from anarchy has no

foundation in fact. The British people conquered India in their own interest from the various Indian States then ruling in the country. There was no anarchy as such. What little there was, was powerless to worry the people who lived in their own little republics the village communities, which from time immemorial formed a bulwark against all anarchy.

We appeal to all the races and peoples of the world to discard the long-current view that British rule rescued India from anarchy. It is a lie, a lie which constant propaganda has helped to be accepted as truth. In the interest of truth and truth alone, let the world revise its view.

---

## CHAPTER IX

### **Whose Driving Force ?**

Almost on every page of Miss Mayo's book is expressed in some form or other, an apprehension that if power is transferred to the responsible Indians, India and Indian interests would go to ruin. She starts with the assumption that if any good can be done to India, it can be done only by the British officer. He alone has the good of India at heart. He is the great angel for the deliverance of India, the great martyr who suffers for India's uplift.

Though, in a previous chapter, we pointed out some disadvantages of British rule in India, we cannot deny that British rule has brought in some good also. When we say this, we do not refer to the claim which the British make that they rescued India from anarchy—this claim has been disproved in the last chapter, and shown to be historically untrue, but we refer to the other good activities of Government, such as the promotion of education, agriculture, co-operation, communications &c. When we refer to these activities of Government, we should not lose sight of three facts ; first, that these are the elementary duties of every Government and if the British Government in India have interested themselves in these activities there is nothing unusual in it; secondly, in almost every activity that the

British Government have undertaken in the direct interest of the people as such, the original idea, the planning of it, and the driving force have come not from Government at all, but from outside agencies and mainly from the enlightened Indians; and thirdly, even when a useful activity is undertaken, it is pushed by Government in a half-hearted manner so that full results thereof cannot be reaped. This last is necessarily the result of the foreign nature of the Government.

Let us try to illustrate these observations by reference to facts. In a previous chapter we discussed the question in regard to social reform and pointed out that there was not a single item of social reform legislation which the British Government in India undertook on their own account. In every case, there was the pressure, the persistent pressure of Indian social reformers and enlightened Indian leaders.

Take now the most beneficent activity, education. To the British Government is rightly due the credit of having introduced Western education in India. But did the British Government originally desire to spread Western education in India? They opposed it tooth and nail. Only after a long struggle in which enlightened Indians led by Raja Ram Mohan Roy took an important part, and only after it was realised that the spread of Western education was inevitable and would proceed in spite of

Government, the Directors of the East India Company finally decided to encourage English education in India, and contributed a small amount for the purpose. The argument that appealed most to Englishmen in those days in coming to this decision, was that the spread of western education among the people would vastly encourage the consumption of British goods in the country.

Even after education was accepted as a function of the State, the amounts utilised for the purpose from the public revenues were small and the progress has been necessarily slow. After more than a century of the consolidated British rule in India, the percentage of literacy remains very low being only 8·2 per cent. This is literacy in the sense of being able to write a letter and read the reply in the vernacular. Among the Hindus, there is one literate person in every thirteen; for males the ratio is one in eight and females one in sixty-three. Among the Mohomedans, there is one male literate in every 11 and one female in every 116.

After more than a century of British rule in India, educational expenditure claims only 5 per cent of the revenues of the Central and Provincial Governments taken together or about 9 per cent of Provincial revenues by themselves. Compared with other countries, India's per capita expenditure on education (from all sources) is very low as the following table will show :—

Per capita expenditure  
(rupees)

British India 1922-23	... 0.77
United Kingdom 1918-19	... 17.3 (at Rs. 15 to the pound)
United States 1919-20	... 37.0 (at Rs. 3 to the dollar)

Government from the very beginning never bothered themselves with any programme for the extension of education. In order to bring about this extension of education and raise the percentage of literacy in the country, the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale introduced in 1911 in the Imperial Council his Elementary Education Bill for the introduction of compulsion on a very modest scale in certain areas in the country, and carried on an active campaign in support of his Bill. Government opposed the measure, and the Council, which as then constituted contained very little popular element, rejected the Bill.

Only after the Montford reforms were introduced and education has been transferred to Indian ministers, has there been some real progress, towards compulsion. In some provinces, notably Bombay, compulsory education Acts have been passed. Even then, the transferred departments being starved of funds, the necessary amount for expenditure on education is not available.



The moral of this is that, even in the matter of education for which great credit is given to British Government, the original idea, the plan and the driving force have come from enlightened Indians, that the British Government left to itself would have done nothing and lastly that the progress therein has been for this reason disappointingly slow.

Take next agriculture. The British Government were originally oblivious of the fact that agriculture was a thing that required attention. They only knew how to assess land revenue, raise it to the highest pitch and recover it in the strictest possible manner no matter what hardship it caused to the poor ryot. It was Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji that first drew the attention of the Government of India and the British people in England to the miserable poverty of the people in India and suggested the promotion of agriculture and industries. Dr. William Hunter also delivered a course of lectures wherein he advocated the creation of agricultural departments. It was then that Dr. Voelcker the great agricultural expert was called out to India to examine Indian agricultural conditions. All these circumstances then hastened the creation of Agricultural Departments.

Take next co-operation. The late Mr. Ranade and the late Sir William Wedderburn were among the first to press upon the Government the need of introducing the co-operative movement in India. But Government stood unmoved for twenty years. It

was only in 1904, at the persistent pressure of enlightened Indians including the late Mr. Gokhale that the Co-operative Societies Act was passed. Even then, one of the motives of Government in passing this Act was that it would assist the ryots to pay their assessment to Government easily by taking loans from the Co-operative Societies. Government had found out that owing to the constantly recurring famines in India, it was getting difficult for them, to recover land revenue from the cultivators and the revenue remained in large arrears with much inconvenience to Government finances. With the introduction of co-operative credit, the ryot pays the assessment in time to Government even when he does not make profits from his cultivation. Somehow money is ready at his hands and he borrows it. It is the convenience of Government more than anything else that was the immediate cause of the Co-operative Act.

The same is the case in regard to irrigation. The need of providing facilities for irrigation by the construction of large protective and productive irrigation works and utilising thereby the vast waters of our rivers for the cultivation of large tracts of land, was being pressed upon Government from time to time. But the appeal was made to deaf ears. Three devastating extensive famines were necessary to rouse Government from their lethargy. These famines took away millions of lives, but Government until then never thought it their business to provide

for such contingencies. They were expending large amounts on the construction of railways because that helped the sale of British goods in India, but irrigation was neglected. As late as 1907, the late Mr. Gokhale complained in the Imperial Council that Government was pushing on railway construction to the neglect of irrigation, and he pointed out that irrigation works directly conduced to the good of the people. If later, large irrigation works were undertaken it was because of the persistent pressure of Indian opinion.

Take next the question of transport facilities. It is a common-place that Railways were constructed mainly from two motives, the strategic consideration, and the commercial consideration. The commercial consideration was the carrying of British goods into the innermost territories for consumption by the people. These railways have had some good results on the progress of India. But that was not the main consideration with the Government, in their original conception.

Similarly, in the case of medical relief and public health, the main pressure came from the Indians themselves. Even in such a matter as this which contains no politics in it, the British Government were slow to make progress. There is a persistent demand from all rural areas for the provision of medical relief and for more funds to be utilised on sanitation, but Government and the British Officer

(Miss Mayo's angel) are giving scant attention to improvement of the sanitary conditions of the villages. The amounts spent in India by Government on medical relief and sanitation bear a ridiculously small proportion to the expenditure on these items in other civilised countries. Miss Mayo ignores this fact altogether and abuses the poor inarticulate Indian villager. You injure him by with-holding the necessary assistance due from you to him, and then for the result of your neglect of him insult him by calling him stupid. We shall have something more to say of this in a later chapter.

Even in the case of the collection and compilation of statistics, Government action was too slow to be up-to-date. It was after Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji pointed out the lines on which Indian statistics required to be improved, and after continuous trenchant criticisms by Sir Dinshaw Wacha the great Indian economist who is happily still living in our midst, that Government improved their methods and extended the statistical activities.

What does all this show? Let everybody try to arrive at an impartial conclusion. It is not necessary when facts are so strong, to press anybody to accept our own conclusion.

The British rule, whatever its disadvantages to Indians may be, has undoubtedly brought certain advantages also. Some of these were the results not of conscious attempts for the good of the people as

such, but were results that followed in the wake of a particular policy which served the Government's own interest. Where beneficial activities such as education, social reform, &c. were undertaken directly for the good of the people, the original idea and the driving force came from the Indians themselves and it was the persistent agitation carried on by these Indian leaders that bore fruit.

From this, it is clear that the British administration of India as at present constituted by its very nature is constitutionally incapable of conceiving measures of reform for Indians when left to itself, that for Indians to bring round the present administration to their view and compel it to take action in the desired direction is a most laborious and cumbersome process, which yields but tardy and meagre results, and that only if larger powers are given to Indians of shaping their own destiny, will speedy reform be brought about.

---

## CHAPTER X

### **Sex-mad.**

Having now adequately discussed the political aspects of Miss Mayo's book, it is time for us to discuss the social part of it. We shall return again to the political aspects about the end of this book but in this and the chapters that follow, the main discussion will be social.

It is never an easy task to understand in their true perspective the social customs and usages of a people or a society wholly different from ours. If an Indian live in England or America for a few months, will he ever be able to get a true idea of the social customs of the people there, even if he be the most observant of men?

The novel features will certainly attract his attention. Kissing and love-making in public will meet his eye everywhere. If merely from the surface of things he should draw conclusions which are not very edifying to the Englishman or American, if for example he thinks that all the girls there are flirts, or that they are used to having promiscuous intercourse with the other sex, would it be a right conclusion?

To know the society there as it really is, to understand its basis and appreciate the motives which actuate men and women, boys and girls, maids and



widows, he must live as an observant person for at least three years in their midst and then too he must have almost daily opportunities of coming into close and intimate contact with the actual life of the people as lived in the inner circles of the families there.

You can understand political conditions from outside and form a tolerably correct judgment on them. But to know the social conditions, social motives, social customs and usages, you must penetrate into the inner depths of the social unit, the family, and only by persistent observation for years can you form some fair judgment of them. Otherwise, your diagnosis is bound to be wrong and when further the mind is already prejudiced you import in your observations the prejudices that you carry with you.

This is what has happened with Miss Mayo. She comes with a determination to humiliate India, she observes everything with a prejudiced eye, and writes down a thesis which is wholly wrong but which she submits to the whole world as the correct picture of India. She forgets that an Indian or a Japanese or a Chinaman can achieve the same feat in regard to Americans and expose them to the ridicule of the world.

Returning now to the social aspects, we find that Miss Mayo's mind is wholly moving about the sex problem. She is an old maiden of 49, and has all along, been absorbed in the attempt to understand

the mystery of sex. If she was a married lady, she would have easily understood what the mystery was. But to a maiden, it would remain a mystery for ever; and as she thinks and thinks, her mind is so transfused with ideas of sex that she can think of nothing else. In anything that she sees, the sex idea inevitably comes; she has what they call a "sex-complex"; she is "sex-mad".

We say, it has not been given to her to know the mystery of sex. As long as she remains un-married, it will remain a mystery. As soon as she gets married, she will at once begin to think otherwise. She will be an improved girl, and an improved woman. Her thoughts will receive a new tone. Her mind will feel a relief. There will be an outlet for the sex ideas and sex imaginations to flow out of the mind into the proper channel. To-day, these sex ideas grow and multiply in her mind, torment her at every step, disfigure her writings and vitiate her findings. Why should she remain an ascetic, and torment her soul?

You cannot understand the sweetness of honey, unless you taste honey. You may read volumes and treatises describing the taste and sweetness of honey. Will that ever help you to understand the taste even by a little bit? All the while, your mind will be wholly absorbed in thinking out as to what kind of taste honey has. But taste a drop of it, and you will understand in an instant. If Miss Mayo is

wasting her energy in solving the mystery of sex without a real experience, she is entirely on the wrong track. Let her get married and enjoy the honeymoon, and then she will begin to talk like a transformed being.

A story is told of the great hankarcharya the greatest expounder of philosophic truth that India or even the world has produced. He won over the whole of India to his faith, but having remained a bachelor from boyhood he had no experience of sexual life, and in one instance failed to satisfy a troublesome interrogator. He then promptly took recourse to a cave in the forest with his disciples, and there he gave up his ghost. Before giving up his ghost he commanded his disciples to preserve his body intact. The soul that flew out of the body, entered the body of a young prince that was just dead, and the young prince having come to life again began to enjoy the worldly pleasures with his wife. Thus the soul of Shankaracharya having gained the sexual experience of life, in time left the prince's body and returned again to its original body in the cave. After acquiring this experience, Shankaracharya was able to vanquish one and all in argument on all topics including the sexual.

Therefore we say, Let Miss Mayo get married and then let her begin to speak on sexual topics. She will not then speak absurdly as she does now.

She sees sculptures and paintings on temple walls and temple chariots and thinks that they are

imbued with sexual representations. She sees the emblems of Gods and finds in them sexual meaning. She marks the particular architecture of buildings and considers they are built on the sexual model. She sees gardens laid down, wells dug, canals cut, rivers trained, but behind them all, as she imagines, runs the sexual idea. There is nothing which meets her eye which she does not visualise with a sexual mind.

We wonder how she forgot to put down even the shape of the Indian peninsula as a representation of a particular sex.

And she seems to be a highly fortunate tourist in India. Everybody that meets her or whose company she seeks, speaks to her, a lady and a foreigner, most unhesitatingly and in the frankest manner possible, about sex and his own sexual experience. So communicative is he and one and all. What an experience ! The Indian Doctor need no more complain now that his patients are least communicative in regard to their sexual complaints.

An imminent Hindu barrister, "one of the best men in his province" whose name however she carefully omits to mention, confesses to her that he indulged too much in sexual intercourse. The doctors and practitioners are free with her to any degree. She is only to suggest that such and such a thing is probable, and they instantly agree and confirm the whole truth of it. "One of the most

distinguished of Indian medical men, a Bombay Brahman, physician, pathologist " confessed to her that the "undeniable race deterioration" of his race, was due to the "expenditure of all vital energy on the single line of sexual indulgence." Being the most distinguished of Indian medical men, that doctor could have been easily marked out in Bombay. Twenty such distinguished Indian medical men in Bombay were asked if they had made such observation to Miss Mayo. None knows anything about it. Miss Mayo has omitted to mention his name. Who can judge whether it is a fabrication or truth? To our mind, it is nothing but a fabrication. Throughout her book, Miss Mayo has demonstrated her unenviable capacity for such fabrications.

The strangeness of the whole thing does not end here. Even the Hindu sages and saints discuss sex with her, the very saints whose whole life is given to devotion and prayers, and whose whole preaching and talk consist of nothing else than the attainment of God. Even such saints discuss sex with her and not only discuss but explain their own private experience of sexual intercourse in the most intimate manner to her, in the manner lewd and depraved prostitutes speak among themselves.

This is her own version of the interview:—

"No question of right or wrong can be involved in any aspect of such matters", a famous Hindu mystic, himself the venerated teacher of multitudes,



explained to me. "I forget the act the moment I have finished it. I merely do it not to be unkind to my wife, who is less illumined than I. To do it or not to do it, signifies nothing. Such things belong only to the world of illusion."

After this, who can deny Miss Mayo's great capacity to draw out the innermost secrets of others' private lives from their own mouths, especially when she is skilful enough to invent things about them and record them as truth as given out to her by themselves ?

For one thing she may even be thanked. She did not invoke the dead men of India, we mean, the spirits of the departed Indian leaders as Spiritualists do, and state to a gaping Western world ready to believe and gulp down their throats whatever is damaging to Indian reputation, that even those spirits of the departed great communicated to her their views about Indian social conditions and confessed that in their own public and private life as also in the national life of India the one great obstacle to progress was sexual indulgence, and sexual exhaustion.

Miss Mayo also deserves our gratitude for not proclaiming direct revelation from God in all the observations she has recorded. According to Christian faith, Gods and angels are fond of virgins, and if she, virgin as she is, receives the revelation and



speaks out of inspiration from above who will dare disbelieve her ?

But why bring in the artificial heavenly aid, she thought, when earthly performance is enough to charm the mind of the West to delusion, and devastate India's prestige and name ?

Or, was it the inspiration of Satan himself that intrigued her into the authorship of this most blasphemous treatise, the "Mother India" ? As from the head of Satan sprang sin, mother of death, so from out of the brains of Miss Mayo has sprung the sinful creation which she calls "Mother India" but which thoughtful men would correctly style "Murder of India."

---

## CHAPTER XI

### **A Holiday For Truth.**

In a noted address on "Truth and Politics" to University students in Edinburgh in November 1925, Mr. Baldwin, the present Prime Minister of England, described how politicians were in the habit of giving a 'holiday for truth' when carrying on propaganda to gain their object, public or private. Though Mr. Baldwin spoke in a somewhat apologetic tone, he was clear enough when he condemned the spread of atrocious lies and monstrous falsehoods.

We can understand a holiday for truth by one politician when he obviously opposes another politician. But Miss Mayo proclaims to the world that she is no propagandist, that her task was undertaken in the most genuine interest of truth, and that she has stated only living facts regarding India. Yet, when under the disguise of such disinterestedness she takes mischievous delight in giving a holiday for truth, as has been amply proved in the foregoing pages, her offence is wholly unpardonable.

Here, however, her sin does not end. It takes a darker colour as she descends to a meaner level and maligns everything Indian because it is Indian. There is nothing in India which is not hateful to her, except of course the British official. Just as to en-

sure the murder of one child the "Massacre of the Innocents" was undertaken, so to gain the one object of her heart, namely, to condemn India to eternal perdition, she is out to destroy everything and pervert everything. With a cruel decision she gives a "holiday for truth," and undertakes an intentional, mischievous manufacture of lies in the filthy factory of her brain, against a sister race which by its undoubted contribution to the civilization of the world certainly deserved well of Miss Mayo.

This mass-production of lies we shall now describe in this chapter. Let us begin with her statement regarding the teaching of un-natural practice to children of young age. She writes:—

"In fact, so far are they from seeing good and evil as we see good and evil, that the mother, high caste or low caste, will practise upon her children—the girl, 'to make her sleep well', the boy, to make him manly', an abuse which the boy at least, is apt to continue for the rest of his life."

And after making this statement for which she gives no authority whatever, not even fictitious authority, she challenges us to disprove this statement. "You can only deny it," she says, "you cannot shake it". Thus she passes as correct, more properly invents from her satanic brain, the wickedest libel against innocent Indian mothers and innocent Indian children. And she calls her book "Mother India".

Regarding this monstrous libel, Lord Sinha observed on the 30th of December last 1927, the day on which he landed in India:—

“ I could conceive of nothing more atrociously false than that statement, and I asked half a dozen members of the Indian Medical Service, who have spent each of them more than 25 years in India, as to whether they had believed her story. They assured me that they had no more heard of it than I have and they were convinced that it is false story.”

The Hindu house-hold is such that even a word of indecent meaning relating to sexual matters uttered by a young child, draws the wrath of the elderly persons and especially the mother, and meets with stern rebuke and sometimes even corporal punishment. It is entirely beyond a Hindu's conception that such practice could prevail in any society, be it the most debased. We had read of course in some of the Western books bearing on social matters, written by famous British doctors and authorities on sexual science and practice, that in England at least it is the practice for the nurses who tend young children to arouse interest in sex matters among these children, and the male children especially are initiated into the mystery of sex by the nurse herself who voluntarily exposes her own organ to their tender fingers to give them some sentimental entertainment and herself some joy and satisfaction. One British authority who has made

life-long research into the rise and growth of sexual sentiment in man from early childhood to youth, has given a realistic picture of his own early experiences and states that when he was barely three years old, his nurse was initiating him into sexual sentiment by practising his finger on her organ.□

Miss Mayo must have read these accounts by medical authorities and research workers, on sexual science and practice, and by the stroke of her fanciful imagination attempts to attribute that evil to the Hindu Society. Quite the worst things are written about Hindu social customs by Christian Missionaries and others, but not in a single instance, not even in the highly coloured, deeply prejudiced, deliberately darkened pictures of Abbe Dubois, does there exist even by implication any reference to such practice. It was left for Miss Mayo, to make this grandest discovery of her life and broadcast it to the edification of the world.

Instead of pretending to throw such light on the Hindu customs, Miss Mayo would have done well to throw more light on some of the practices said to be current among elderly maids in the West and especially in America. It is stated for instance that American elderly maids are in the habit of keeping monkeys and fondly bringing them up as their pets, and the use of these monkeys to them is this. These monkeys are made to practise on them and thus serve to give these maids partial satisfaction. We

do not know to what extent this practice is current in America but Miss Mayo must be able with her well-advertised training and experience as a social investigator to throw light on a practice prevailing in her own country about which she can speak with greater authority than about any other people.

Another interesting and equally disgusting specimen of the production of her lie-manufacturing factory, is found in the following libel. Says Miss Mayo :—

“In many parts of the country, north and south, the little boy, his mind so prepared, is likely, if physically attractive, to be drafted for the satisfaction of grown men, or to be regularly attached to a temple, in the capacity of a prostitute. Neither parent as a rule sees any harm in this, but is rather flattered that the son has been found pleasing.”

No such practice has ever been heard of in India. The practice that prevails in certain areas of the country among the lower classes is in regard to *girls* who are attached to temples and are called Deodasis (servants of God). This practice could have been stopped long ago if the British Government in India were favourable to the reform. The State of Mysore has already abolished the practice but the “civilized” British Government still remains indifferent. It may be mentioned, however, that the practice has declined considerably during recent years owing mainly to the personal efforts of Indian



social reformers. The point that has to be noted is that the practice that prevails is in regard to *girls* and not in regard to *boys*.

Then again, according to Miss Mayo, "the average male Hindu of thirty years, provided he has means to command his pleasure, is an old man; and that from seven to eight out of every ten such males between the ages of twenty-five and thirty are impotent." What an idea! Where did Miss Mayo acquire this experience of impotency? Who were her informants and what are their credentials? Are they males or are they females?

In one part of the book, Miss Mayo passes pungent remarks on the desire of elderly men, if widowers, to have young wives, and their sexual-mindedness even at a late age. If men between the ages of fifty and sixty can still retain a desire for sexual co-habitation, where is the proof of their impotency? Thus, Miss Mayo is guilty of the charge of making a particular statement first and in the very next breath making an altogether inconsistent statement.

The Hindus have ever been and are even to-day a highly fertilising race, even more fertilising than some other western races, and the allegation that 75 per cent. of the Hindus are impotent before thirty, is the gravest falsehood.

In his essay on "Education", Mr. Herbert Spencer speaks of the two inevitable instincts which

in man, as in other animals, work as part of their nature, the instinct for self-preservation and the instinct for race-preservation. Among the races of mankind, the Hindus may be lacking in self-preservation, but so far as race-preservation is concerned, their very laws have laid down religious notions in regard to continuity in family and the race has been preserved as no other race has been preserved during the last thirty centuries or more, in spite of loss of independence and want of self-preservation in the later centuries.

And the man of means, states Miss Mayo, is more liable to such impotency. If it were indeed a fact, so many of our elderly Indian princes and chiefs, and many other wealthy gentlemen would not be going to England frequently and staying there for months together, to pass jolly good time in company with English beauties.

Then comes Miss Mayo's attack on the emblems of Gods and on religious marks. "Siva, one of the Hindu deities, is represented on highroad shrines, in the temples, on the little altar of the home or in personal amulets, by the image of the male generative organ, in which shape he receives the daily sacrifices of the devout. The followers of Vishnu multitudinous in the south from their childhood wear painted upon their foreheads the sign of the function of generation."

The origin of such emblems and signs has always been enveloped in mystery. Scholars of repute

have tried in vain to come to any agreement on the point and excepting various suggestions, some fanciful, some probable, nothing has been offered as yet in the direction of certainty. Miss Mayo, however, is more scholarly and much wiser than all the scholars of repute put together, and what they hesitated to do, she did in an instant and gave out definitely that the images and marks represent the sexual organs. Perhaps Miss Mayo's rashness is the finest illustration of the proverbial remark—

“Fools rush in, where angels fear to tread.”

Or is it the illustration of the other truth that “Men worship God after their own image”? Miss Mayo's mind is wholly sexualised and it is no wonder if she imports her highly sexualised ideas and notions of sex in her interpretation of the images of Gods.

It is interesting to note also that, even if it is taken for granted that Miss Mayo's reading of the sexual origin in the image is right, the worship is of the male organ only and not of the female. The charge of sensuality brought by Miss Mayo is chiefly against men and in that case it is consistent and reasonable to suppose that they should have worshipped the female generative organ. Instead, both men and women worship the same image of Shiva, which indicates that Miss Mayo's interpretation may be wholly fanciful.

One wonders why there is a tendency among a certain class of recent writers to find explanations

of such things in sex. Mr. K. Natarajan pointed out in his series of articles on "Mother India" in the "Indian Social Reformer," that in a certain little book entitled "Mystery of the Circle and the Cross" by Francis Swiney, the Christain Cross itself is traced to a phallic origin. If Miss Mayo is a true Christian, let her explain this mystery first and try to answer Mr. Swiney's argument, and only after demolishing him let her think of the images of Hindu Gods. If she accepts Mr. Swiney's suggestion, then there would be nothing left for her to complain against in regard to Hindu images of God.

But whatever the real origin of the image may be, does it even remotely influence the mind of the devotee? The statement that practice gives them "literal meaning and suggestive power" is wholly false. The Hindus, be they of lower class or of the higher class, do not even dream in their minds that the image could have a phallic origin. This writer himself had not the least notion of such origin until in the college, he happened to read a pamphlet by a Christian Missionary. The people have no understanding of the mystic nature of the emblems whatever their interpretation may be, and even when the idea is driven into their mind, they refuse to entertain it, much less believe it. It is well known that when some Christian Missionaries in the south tried to inject such ideas into the minds of the common people in their zeal for the spread of their civilization and Christianity, there was considerable disturbance

among the populace and the Missionaries had to seek the protection of Government.

This shows conclusively that the Hindus in their worship of God Siva, are totally unaware of the origin of his image whatever it may be, but act in the true devotional spirit. Even Mr. H. H. Wilson, the historian, Christian though he was and disposed to give credence to the phallic origin of the emblem of Siva, has remarked as follows:—

“Notwithstanding the acknowledged purport of the worship, it is but just to state that it is unattended in upper India by any indecent or indelicate ceremonies, and *it requires a rather lively imagination to trace any resemblance in its symbols to the objects they are supposed to represent.*”\*

Such then are a few of the incidents of the ill-intentioned cruel pastime which Miss Mayo indulged in during the ‘holiday for truth.’ May her Father in Heaven forgive her, and may her soul rest in place !

---

\*Quoted in Encyclopædia Britannica (thirteenth edition, 1926) in the article on “Hinduism.”

## CHAPTER XII

### **The Massacre of the Innocents.**

It is no wonder if Indians have begun to feel in these days, that "murderers are abroad." We do not mean murderers who kill men, but murderers who kill truth. Miss Mayo is only one instance of such a murderer. There are hundred others who malign India and the Indians, day in and day out, in public and in private, in contributions to the public press and in conversations in private circles, and murder truth without hesitation and without compunction. India with that inborn religious tolerance which is her characteristic and in a spirit of charity, not only forgives these crimes to these murderers, but prays in return to her Gods that these murderers who by killing the truth kill their own souls, may be saved from the torments of hell and everlasting perdition.

Nobody in India is indeed safe from Miss Mayo's virulent pen. Young and old, men and women, the rich and the poor, great men and small men, saints and sinners, are all alike victims to her insatiate fury. We give below some instances of her campaign to massacre the innocents, which would show how she has carried fire and sword into the Indian camp with a cruelty and indiscrimination which even Tamerlane was incapable of.



Take first her wilful misrepresentation of Mr. Gandhi. Even he, poor soul, saintly as he is, has felt the anguish of her poisoned arrow. Says he:—

“But in her hurry to see everything Indian in a bad light, she has not only taken liberty with my writings, but she has not thought it necessary even to verify through me certain things ascribed by her or others to me. In fact she has combined in her own person what we understand in India the judicial and the executive officer. She is both the Prosecutor and the Judge.”

It would be interesting to relate here one incident at least, first as Miss Mayo narrates it with her characteristic disregard for truth and with a wilful misrepresentation to serve her own ends, and next as it actually occurred. Miss Mayo's account runs thus:—

“But once upon a time it chanced that Mr. Gandhi, having widely and publicly announced that hospitals are institutions for propagating sin; that ‘European doctors are the worst of all’ and that ‘quacks whom we know are better than the doctors who put on an air of humaneness’, himself fell suddenly ill of a pain in the side.

As he happened to be in prison at the time, a British surgeon of the Indian Medical Service came straightway to see him.

“Mr. Gandhi” said the surgeon, as the incident was reported, “I am sorry to have to tell you that

you have appendicitis. If you were my patient, I should operate at once. But you will probably prefer to call in your Ayurvedic physician'.

Mr. Gandhi proved otherwise-minded.

"I should prefer not to operate" pursued the surgeon, "because in case the outcome should be unfortunate, all your friends will lay it as a charge of malicious intent against us whose duty it is to care for you."

"If you will only consent to operate" pleaded Mr. Gandhi, "I will call in my friends now, and explain to them that you do so at my request."

So, Mr. Gandhi wilfully went to an "institution for propagating sin"; was operated upon by one of the 'worst of all' an officer of the Indian Medical Service, and was attentively nursed through convalescence by an English sister whom he is understood to have thought after all rather a useful sort of person."

Such is the version of Miss Mayo. It should not be supposed that the words, the expressions and the sentiments were really uttered by the parties concerned but have been put into their mouths by Miss Mayo, according as they suited her purpose. The conversation as narrated is such as Miss Mayo would desire it to be.

In juxta-position to this, may be placed the following short comment on it by Mr. Gandhi

himself, the principal actor therein. Says Mr. Gandhi:—

“This is a travesty of truth. I shall confine myself to correcting only what is libellous and not the other inaccuracies. There was no question here of calling in any Ayurvedic physician. Col. Maddock who performed the operation had the right, if he had so chosen, to perform the operation without a reference to me, and even in spite of me. But he and Surgeon-General Houton showed a delicate consideration to me, and asked me whether I would wait for my own doctors who were known to them and were also trained in the Western Medical and Surgical science. I would not be behind-hand in returning their courtesy and consideration, and I immediately told them that they could perform the operation without waiting for my doctors to whom they had telegraphed, and that I would gladly give them a note for their protection in the event of the operation miscarrying. I endeavoured to show that I had no distrust either in their ability or their good faith. It was to me a happy opportunity of demonstrating my personal goodwill.”

No creature on earth would question Mr. Gandhi's truthfulness not only in this matter but in regard to everything else, while the doubtful nature of Miss Mayo's assertions and her second-hand sources of information make her account of the story thoroughly unreliable. It may be added that the principal per-

sons including the surgeon who were in attendance at the conversation and at the operation have corroborated Mr. Gandhi's version of the story.

Let us now proceed further. Another innocent included by Miss Mayo in her "Massacre of the Innocents" is the Poet Rabindranath Tagore. In order to show that even so modern and reformed a personage as Dr. Tagore supports and admires child marriage, she has represented him and his opinions in the following words:—

"Rabindranath Tagore, in a recent essay on the "Indian Ideal of Marriage," explains child marriage as a flower of the sublimated spirit, a conquest over sexuality and materialism won by exalted intellect for the eugenic uplift of the race. His conclusion however logically implies the conviction, simply, that Indian women must be securely bound and delivered before their womanhood is upon them; if they are to be kept in hand.....In other words, a woman must be married before she knows she is one."

The whole of this view written in Miss Mayo's own words is inferred from a quotation from an essay which Dr. Tagore wrote by request for being included in "The Book of Marriage" by Count Hermann Keyserling. The quotation as cited by Miss Mayo runs as follows:—

"The desire.....against which India's solution of the marriage problem declared war, is one of nature's

most powerful fighters; consequently, the question of how to overcome it was not an easy one. There is a particular age,.....at which this attraction of the sexes reaches its height; so if marriage is to be regulated according to the social will (as distinguished from the choice of the individual concerned) it must be finished with before such age. Hence the Indian custom of early marriage."

Mr. K. Natarajan of the "Indian Social Reformer," was the first to detect in this quotation as cited by Miss Mayo, the omission of two highly important words which give quite a different turn to Miss Mayo's presentation of Dr. Tagore's views. The important words omitted are "said India" between "a particular age" and "at which." What Dr. Tagore wanted to convey was that Indian social polity was based on this particular conception and logic. Miss Mayo omitted these most important words, with the deliberate purpose of representing Dr. Tagore as the advocate and protagonist of child marriage.

Dr. Tagore even makes it still more clear that he is explaining the logic behind the Indian social polity in a passage in the same essay which follows the quotation cited above. That passage continues the argument as follows:—

*"These must have been the lines of argument, in regard to married love, pursued in our country. For the purpose of marriage spontaneous love is.*

unreliable; its proper cultivation should yield the best results.....*Such was the conclusion* and this cultivation should begin before marriage. Therefore, from their earliest years, the husband as an idea is held up before our girls, in verse and story, through ceremonial and worship.”

The words italicised by us in this passage, show unmistakably that he is merely explaining the reason behind the particular custom. It does by no means indicate that he gives any support to that reasoning or to that custom. Yet Miss Mayo quotes in another part of her book, this passage also in a mutilated form, and takes care besides to leave out the particular words italicised above, evidently to foist upon the poet the views which he never personally holds, and to damn him in the eyes of her readers.

Thus not once, but twice does Miss Mayo lie about Dr. Tagore, and what is still more astonishing, most shamelessly does she preface the mutilated quotation with the following comment:—

“In the handling of this point by the modern, Rabindranath Tagore, appears another useful hint as to the caution we might well observe in accepting at their face value to us, the expressions of Hindu speakers and writers.”

She suggests hereby that people in the West should observe caution in accepting Dr. Tagore's expressions. Poor Dr. Tagore never holds the views



ascribed to him by Miss Mayo. The true advice to all Miss Mayo's readers should be that they should observe caution in accepting at their face value Miss Mayo's expressions or quotations. Indeed, Miss Mayo's whole conduct in this matter is so shameful that she is utterly unfit to be associated with by people in respectable society. That Western Society should admit her into respectable circles is only an indication of their moral degradation.

It is because of this her most shameful act that Dr. Tagore's usually equanimous temper burst into a flame of indignation finding its expression in the following significant remark:—

“We have become painfully familiar with deliberate circulation of hideous lies in the west against enemy countries, but a similar propaganda against individuals, whose countrymen have obviously offended the writer by their political aspirations, has come to me as a surprise.”

As everybody in India knows, Dr. Tagore is a great Social Reformer. He is wholly against child marriage and girls in his family get married only when they are grown up. In the same essay in the “Book of Marriage” he states his own view so clearly that it leaves no doubt that child marriage is an institution which he condemns beyond measure and to which he attributes a number of evils in Hindu society.

Many more incidents in this massacre of the innocents may be related; but we shall close this chapter with only one more, in which Mr. Lajpat Rai has been able to nail the lie to the counter. Miss Mayo relates the following story in her chapter entitled "The Princes of India":—

"Then I recall a little party given in Delhi by an Indian friend, in order that I might privately hear the opinions of certain Home Rule politicians. Most of the guests were like my host, Bengali Hindus belonging to the Western educated professional class. They had spoken at length on the coming expulsion of Britain from India and on the future in which they themselves would rule the land.

"And what" I asked "is your plan for the princes?"

"We shall wipe them out!" exclaimed one with conviction. And all the rest nodded assent."

To investigate the truth of this story, Mr. Lajpat Rai made inquiries from all the possible people who could have arranged such a party or who could have attended it and he learnt that Mr. K. C. Roy of the Associated Press had arranged a lunch to which a number of Indian gentlemen were invited. Mr. K. C. Roy assures Mr. Lajpat Rai that Miss Mayo's story of what transpired at the meeting is absolutely untrue. The following letter also which Mr. Lajpat Rai received from Mrs. K. C. Roy is expressive enough:—

“My dear Lalaji,

Many thanks for your inquiry. We gave a lunch party to Miss Mayo at Maidens Hotel, Delhi, during her short stay in the Capital. She came to us with excellent introductions. At the lunch, there were only two Bengalis, namely my husband and Mr. Sen. All the others were non-Bengalis. Prominent among our guests were Mr. M. A. Jinnah, leader of the Independent Party, and Mr. S. Chetty. As I can recollect, the discussion ran on Indian constitutional development, her defence, communal harmony, child-welfare, and art and culture in Delhi. I do not recollect whether the position of the Indian Princes was discussed. At any rate I know that there was no discussion as to their being “wiped out.”

Simla,  
*September, 7th 1927.* }

Yours sincerely,  
 DOROTHY ROY.

Mr. Lajpat Rai inquired of Messrs. Jinnah and Chetty also and got their assurance that the question regarding princes was not discussed at all.

Such are the exploits of Miss Mayo. With such cruelty and without conscience has she systematically carried out the massacre of the innocents.

An Indian who had gone to the United States was invited to deliver several addresses in various centres there. At one of the meetings, a questioner who was of course ignorant, complained that there was no word for “conscience” in the Indian language. “Yes” retorted the Indian; “you have the word, but we have the substance.”

## CHAPTER XIII

### **Marriage and Child-Birth.**

It has been an admitted fact that the custom of early marriage is an important social evil of India. How the custom first came into existence is still a mystery. Some consider, not without reason, that the practice came into vogue with Mohomedan rule. Whatever the truth may be, one cannot doubt the fact that in ancient India the practice did not prevail. In our ancient literature of pre-Mohomedan period, we read of heroes and heroines grown up and seeking each other's love before the actual marriage took place. However, the institution of early marriage has somehow come to be characteristic of the Hindu social polity and is undoubtedly a retarding factor in their progress.

When, therefore, Miss Mayo condemns early marriage, she is doing nothing more than what Indian social reformers have been doing for years past. But she draws a highly grotesque picture as if to show that Hindus are mere worms crawling in a dung-heap whose sole occupation is to generate and regenerate. Her readers, therefore, get easily tainted with an impression that the Hindu society is suffering from a canker from which it may never recover and which would only lead it to extinction.

The impression thus created is wholly misleading. We shall discuss in this chapter some very interesting points regarding early marriage among the Hindus and shall prove conclusively that the conditions are not so bad as they are depicted to be, and secondly that there are hopeful signs of rapid improvement. We would even point out many redeeming features even in the present state of society, but we would refrain from emphasizing them too much, because we may thereby give some handle to social reactionaries amongst the Hindus who may flaunt our own apologies before their audiences as arguments in their favour and thereby obstruct social reform to which we ourselves are wedded.

We have, therefore, to proceed with caution and step by step. Let us first note that the institution of early marriage though undoubtedly devitalising in its effects, is not wholly without its redeeming features. In the first chapter of his "History of European Morals," Mr. Lecky the great historian, discussing the custom of early marriages in Ireland, observes as follows:— "The nearly universal custom of early marriages among the Irish peasantry has alone rendered possible that high standard of female chastity, that intense and jealous sensitiveness respecting female honour, for which among many failings and some vices, the Irish poor have long been pre-eminent in Europe."

Mr. Lecky further points out that it is this custom more than anything else that is responsible

for the “unparalleled absence among the Irish priesthood of those moral scandals which in every continental country occasionally prove the danger of vows of celibacy.” Thus it is certain that early marriage is a powerful cause of the maintenance of chastity in a society and this explains the very high standard of chastity among the Hindus as compared with Western peoples.

The question arises, “which ideal is preferable, that of chastity or that of physical advancement?” It is difficult to make a choice, for both are needed for the up-keep of society. However, the Indian social reformer, while strictly enjoining personal purity in social conduct, has declared himself against early marriage and has been incessantly working to break the custom.

Let us also try to understand how this custom of early marriage appears to the unbiassed eyes of a sympathetic critic from the West and how it compares with the western custom of late marriages as it prevails to-day. Rev. J. Tyssul Davis makes the following remarks in this connection regarding late marriages in England:—

“Though the legal act of marriage in England until very recently was 12 for girls, and 14 for boys, as a result of education and the growth of athleticism and the gradual change of public opinion, the tendency has been to advance the age so far that now scientists are arguing for going back from 25 to 30 for



the woman and 30 to 40 for the man due to the severer claims of the standard of living, to an earlier and fresher age. In some countries that favour late marriage, youth has been protracted so that from 25 to 30 there is still the buoyancy and youthfulness and young people are still lads and lasses whereas in other countries they bear the responsibilities of family life."

Then with special reference to the Hindu custom and the reason behind it, Mr. Davis observes:—

"The custom of child marriage in India is not merely due to the accident of Moslem conquest, when the rulers promised to protect all girls who were already affianced. But there is more in it. There is the difference of ideals. In Hindu India, because the house-hold is an essential element in its social structure, marriage is almost compulsory like conscription in Europe on the threat of war. To perform the duties of a house-holder is in fact looked upon as a special discipline (as distinct from the Western idea of property as something entirely within the owner's right)."

How would social conditions in the West in regard to marriage shape themselves in future as a set-off to present undesirable developments? Mr. Davis sagely observes:—

"In the course of the evolution of Hindu idea of marriage, the kind favoured by the West founded

by the mutual attraction, was given a trial. It was found wanting and discarded. Is it possible that we shall at some future date discard it?"

Thus even Mr. Davis, a gentleman bred up in Western institutions, sees the possibility of Western society itself discarding late marriages and adopting the system of early marriages. Mr. Davis further discusses the social aspect as distinct from the individual aspect of the Hindu marriage. He says:—

“What is the kind of marriage that will preserve the integrity and keep the stable equilibrium of society—that is what Hinduism tried to discover. Just as the Royal Houses of Europe used to arrange marriages for reasons of State, just as Eugenics bids men sacrifice personal sentiment to human progress, so the Hindu does the same to withhold the seductions of the Life-Force in the interests of social good—that is the idea. The mother is encouraged to undergo voluntary penance for the elevation of the human race, and to keep her natural instinct in rigorous subordination to the dictates of mind and soul. The sense of degradation some women feel in submitting to the tyranny of nature over their sex is avoided not by adjuring motherhood but by making it subserve an impersonal ideal.”

Another important point that Western readers have to note, which Miss Mayo has omitted to mention to them, is that marriage among Hindus is only

a betrothal. The marriage is not consummated until a later period, until at least after the girl attains puberty. The married girl i. e. betrothed has to live in her husband's family where under the training of her mother-in-law she learns to accommodate herself to her new surroundings and begins to love the house-hold as her own before she actually becomes the mistress of the house. Not until at least puberty is attained is she allowed to co-habit with her husband. Thus the evils of early marriage are to that extent controlled and minimised.

“Real child-marriage—the wedding of children who have not yet reached puberty” says Mr. Otto Rothfield, I. C. S., in his “Women of India” (1924), “is after all nothing more than an indefeasible betrothal.”

To the Hindu woman, marriage is a life-companionship and not a mere contract for sexual relationship into which it has degenerated in the West at present. While yet a young girl, she is taught to like and love a young man to whom she is wedded. Similarly, the young man learns to love his wife because she is to be his companion for life. Thus the love that naturally springs in each other simultaneously, and in healthy surroundings, because it finds its roots in duty spiritual, social and personal, is no more a wayward fancy but acquires an enduring quality.

Mr. Otto Rothfield, the author quoted above observes:—“Moreover in practice child-marriage

has some clear advantages. For it allows the wedded pair to be brought up together as children only in their parents' houses, till in time they become habituated to each other's company and affection, while gradually they come to know and learn their place in these large households to which their future lives belong.

"The real marriage, the consummation of their growth to man and woman, comes much later, after many years perhaps, when their parents at last give their consent to the grown student and the healthy maiden who helps daily in the house-hold tasks."

To show accurately what the real evil consists in and to locate its exact situation, Mr. Rothfield very pertinently writes:—"Rather it is not the child-marriage that is so much to be deprecated as the marriage that succeeds, as in some cases it does, too quickly with puberty. For by an unhappy ignorance, puberty is in India only too often thought, *as it was thought in the Europe of the Renaissance*, to be maturity."

Having now discussed the advantages and disadvantages both of early marriages and late marriages, and having made our own position clear, namely that we are whole-heartedly against early marriages, let us now return to consider the sweeping statements of Miss Mayo on this question. "The Indian girl, in common practice," she says "looks for

motherhood nine months after reaching puberty or anywhere between the ages of fourteen and eight. The latter is extreme, although in some sections, exceptional; the former is well above the average."

Thus Miss Mayo alleges that the majority of Indian girls attain motherhood between the ages of fourteen and eight. In other words the marriage itself in the majority of cases takes place between the age of 7 years and three months and 13 years and 3 months. Is this her allegation correct?

The Census report ought to throw light on this point. Though we cannot find therein the exact number of persons married, between the age of eight and fourteen, we can know the number of persons married and unmarried between the ages 0-5, 5-10, 10-15, &c. For our present purpose, let us take the ages 10-15. This is a convenient period for our comparison because it approximately coincides with the period stated by Miss Mayo to be the most usual among Indians for motherhood. This period also errs on the side of Miss Mayo and is favourable to her. Now referring to Table I on age 164 of the Census Report Vol. I of 1921, one will find that out of every 1000 females between the ages 10-15, 399 were married or widows and 601 are unmarried. And as it is not the custom in India to leave any female unmarried, it may fairly be stated that among Indians, the greater number of marriages, at least 60 per cent take place after the age of 15. This fact in itself is sufficient to disprove Miss Mayo's allegation.

When the majority of marriages among the females themselves take place after the age of 15, it is silly to contend that motherhood is usually attained between the ages of eight and fourteen. Miss Mayo's statement thus falls to the ground, not only because there is no evidence to corroborate it, but also because there is evidence to the contrary in the Census Report of 1921.

Let us also recall here a more direct proof to show the enormity of Miss Mayo's picture. This is supplied by Dr. Miss Margaret Balfour who is doing research work in Maternity and Infant welfare at the Haffkine Institute, Bombay. In the course of a letter to the Times of India, she writes as follows:—

“I have notes of 304 Hindu mothers delivered of their first babies in Bombay hospitals. The average age was 18.7 years; 85.6 per cent. were 17 years or over; 14.4 per cent were below 17; 14 was the youngest age and there were 3 of that age.”

This is about Bombay. But Miss Balfour gives figures for Madras also. She continues:—

“I have compared these figures with the reports of the Madras Maternity Hospital for the years 1922-24. 2312 mothers were delivered of their first babies. The average age was 19.4 years. 86.2 per cent were 19 years or over and 13.8 per cent were below 17; 13 was the youngest age. There were 7 mothers aged 13 and 22 mothers aged 14. The Madras figures



included not only Hindus but women of other communities also."

Lastly in regard to other parts of India, Miss Balfour states:—

"I have reports of 3964 cases of child-birth from other parts of India including the North. Of these only 10 were below 15 years of age; 13 was the youngest age."

On the basis of these figures, Miss Balfour very rightly concludes that "the cases instanced by Miss Mayo do not in the least represent the common customs of the country."

Apart from this, however, social reformers in India are quite alive to the position as it is. They have never shirked their duty in this matter but have been working continuously in the direction of improvement. In addition to personal example and public agitation, they have from time to time pressed Government for legislation helpful to the raising of the age of marriage. The latest instance is the Bill introduced in the Assembly by Rai Saheb Harbilas Sarda, and if this Bill is passed, it will put an effective check to child marriages.

It will not be out of place to mention here that instead of supporting and adopting Sir Hari Singh Gour's Bill to raise the age of consent to 14 moved in Delhi Session (1928) of the Assembly, Government have only found pretext to appoint a

Committee on child-marriage and thereby to delay the necessary and urgent reform.

While every social reformer is aware that much still remains to be accomplished, he finds every reason from progress in the past to be hopeful of the future. The Census Reports give encouraging figures, and the last Report (1921) contains the following observations:—

“Whatever may be the causes to which the change may be attributed, the figures clearly show an increase in the numbers of those in the early age-categories who are still unmarried. The movement is most marked in the Hindu community but is shared by the other religions, the change being less noticeable among the Buddhist and Christian communities, who are not addicted to early marriage. The change is most conspicuous in the age-categories 10-15 for women and 10-20 for men.”

This is the opinion of the Census Commissioner based on the plentiful and convincing data at his disposal. If actual figures are to be quoted, it will be seen that out of every 1000 persons among males between the age 15 to 20, the number of unmarried persons at the 1881 census was 617 ; it rose to 650 in 1901 and 687 in 1921. Similarly among females, out of every 1000, the number of unmarried between the ages 10-15, was 481 in 1881, but rose to 559 in 1901 and 601 in 1921. This is surely progress which may not be rapid, but which is certainly hope-

ful considering the conservative instincts of the Indian population, and its heavy bulk.

As the Census Commissioner points out, the rise in the age of marriage is most marked in Bengal and Bihar and Orissa. This circumstance is of special significance because Miss Mayo attacks the Bengalees most on this question. The Census Report of 1921 remarks as follows in regard to Bengal and Bihar and Orissa :—

“The number of males left unmarried between the ages of 10 and 15 had risen from 826 in 1891 to 868 in 1921, the increase in the age-period 15 to 20 being from 594 to 665. The case of girls is still more striking, the increase in the age-period 10 to 15 being from 372 to 494; and for both males and females, the rise during the last decade has been exceptionally high.”

Mr. Thompson, Superintendent of Census for Bengal, Bihar and Orisa, makes the following special observation in his report:—

“It is apparent from these figures that both in Bengal and in the two provinces together, there has been a steady rise in the average age at which marriage takes place. This age both for males and females is very much lower in Bihar and Orisa than in Bengal, but in both it is rising and the rise has apparently been more decided during the last decade than in previous ones.”

Discussing the causes of this rise in the age of marriage, the Census Commissioner observes:—

“There are various influences which should tend to raise the age of marriage in the Indian community. In the first place with the spread of education and increasing contact with Western ideals, there is undoubtedly growing among the higher classes, a wider realisation of the evils attending the practice of infant marriage. The economic factor again, if less constant in its operation, has even greater force and it is probably to this influence more than to any other, that is due the change which, as we shall see, the figures of the present census show in respect of the age of marriage. Among boys and even to some extent also among girls, the spread of school education has had a direct influence on the practice, since parents are often unwilling to withdraw their children from school for their marriage, before their education is complete.”

If Government would devote to educational expenditure 10 per cent of the revenues of the Central and Provincial Governments taken together, instead of 5 per cent as at present, what an immense gain would it prove to social reform !

---

## CHAPTER XIV

### **The Position of Women—I.**

Miss Mayo often repeats in her book that she writes as the great advocate of women in India and she wants to suggest by her exaggerated account of the conditions of women, that they are the most ill-treated in the world. An English or American reader is likely to get the impression that while she writes this account, pity is dropping out of her humane heart, throbbing with the burning desire to serve the women-folk of India.

Possibly Miss Mayo thought that by playing this game of women against men, she would gain the ears of the women of India. But she must have been sadly disillusioned by now. The women of India have held meetings in every part of India and have unanimously protested against *her* discription of their troubles. Whatever the position of women in India may be at present, Miss Mayo's account of it is wholly misleading and unreliable, and sometimes even disfigured by direct lies.

' We shall now discuss in this chapter the position of women in India in the past and their position to-day. It is not our object to contend that all is well with Indian women. Much of what is low in their position is due to the practice of early marriage which, as described in the last chapter, is

slowly declining and secondly the want of education has also its influence. This latter question of female education we shall discuss in the next chapter.

As regards the position of women in the past, it is sufficient to state here that all evidence tends to show that they were treated at least as equals to men. The late Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar in his well known paper, the "Social History of India," has pointed out with authorities how high a position women held in society in India's past. Professor H. H. Wilson the great historian who edited Mill's History of India asserts confidently that "in no nation of antiquity were women held in so much esteem as amongst the Hindus."

Women did not lead secluded lives. They were not kept in the Zenana. No purdah system existed then. There are instances of women of having accompanied their husbands in warfare and taken part therein. It is said that Draupadi, the wife of the Pandawas, played an important part in administration, superintended the management of the palace and its treasuries, supervised the religious institutions of the nation and instructed the subjects in the duties and rights of women.

The Mahabharata, the great Hindu epic describes woman as follows:—"The wife is the half of man; the wife is the best of friends; the wife is the root of the three-fold worldly activity; the wife is the root of salvation".



As regards the legal status of the wife, Manu the great Hindu law-giver of ancient India, lays down as follows:—

(1) If a wife dies, her husband may marry another wife. If a husband dies, a wife may marry another husband.

(2) If a wife becomes fallen by drunkenness and immorality, her husband may marry another. If a husband becomes fallen, a wife may remarry another husband.

(3) If a wife be barren, her husband may marry another wife. If a husband be impotent she may marry another husband.

(4) In particular circumstances, a wife may cease to co-habit with her husband.

(5) If a husband deserts a wife she may marry another.

The above proves conclusively the rights possessed by women in ancient India.

The right to property is still more marked. According to Professor Wilson, “the right of women to property is fully recognised and fully secured”. He also states as follows:—“In the absence of direct male heirs, widows succeed to a life interest in real and absolute interest in personal property. Next, daughters inherit absolutely. Where there are sons, mothers and daughters are entitled to shares, and wives hold peculiar property from a variety of

sources, besides those specified by the text, over which a husband has no power during their lives, and which descends to their own heirs, with a preference in some cases to females. It is far from correct therefore to say, that women amongst Hindus are excluded from the rights of property."

Such was the position of women in ancient India. Let us now examine the position as it is today. In the course of ages, through the influence of several factors, the position has undoubtedly deteriorated, but from the account that we give below it will be seen that the position is not so bad as it appears at first sight to a Western observer who has no means of knowing first-hand what lies behind the veil. So far as the right to property is concerned, this has remained inviolable through ages and the position of Hindu woman to-day in respect of this right is the same that it was in ancient times, i.e. during the time of Manu. If anything, it has improved. Therefore so far as this right is concerned, there is nothing to complain of.

It is a common-place to say that in present times women are not treated with respect in India, that they are held in little esteem, that any sort of ill-treatment of them is held pardonable. Such statements are based only on superficial observations such as those made by Miss Mayo. From Miss Mayo's writing it would appear to an outsider that women in

India are always kept in bondage and under strict surveillance. This is far from being a fact.

Father Dubois, the French Catholic Missionary in India, whom we have already quoted in a previous chapter, and of whose "Hindu Manners and Customs" Miss Mayo has made full use in damning the Indians, himself bears evidence to the high esteem in which women are held in India. "It may be said with truth," says he in a letter, dated 1st October 1821 (Letters on Christianity), "that so far are the Hindu females from being held in that low state of contempt and degradation.....that on the contrary, they lie under much less restraint, enjoy more real freedom and are in possession of more enviable privileges than the persons of their sex in any other Asiatic country."

To remove the misimpression that is usually created on an outsider by the outward roughness and austerity of the husband to the wife, Father Dubois further observes in the same letter:—"In the meanwhile, the austerity and roughness with which they are outwardly treated in public by their husbands, is rather a matter of form and entirely ceases when the husband and his wife are in private. It is then that the Hindu females assume all that empire which is every-where exercised in civilized countries by the persons of their sex over the male part of the creation; find means to bring them under subjection and rule over them in several instances with a despo-

tic sway. In short, although outwardly exposed in public to the forbidding and repulsive frowns of an austere husband they can be considered in no other light than as perfectly the mistresses within the house."

Another recent writer Mr. Otto Rothfield, I.C.S., who has spent about 30 years in India and has acquired intimate knowledge of the social customs in India at the present day, has very interesting remarks to make on the position of Indian women in his valuable work on "Women of India" published only about four years ago. He says:—"Their very aloofness, their seclusion, gives them half their charm and they know it. Not for them, for instance, the dismal methods of American schools where mixed classes and common play-ground rub away all the attraction of the sexes, and make their pupils dully kin like brother and sister. *In India women are so much valued and attain half their power because they are only occasionally seen and seldom met.*"

Thus Miss Mayo's conclusion that because women in India do not move about in free association with men, they are necessarily in a degrading condition or are held in very little esteem, is wholly wrong.

On page 98 of his "Education of India" (1926) Mr. Arthur Mayhew very rightly observes:—"The importance of the woman in the Indian household has never properly been appreciated by the Englishman

to whom the home life is but seldom revealed. Let us hear what the Hindu has to say about it and realise that much of what he says could be supported by a Mohomedan. For that Islamic device, the purdah, signifies the reverence attached to women and the wish to concentrate their influence on the home far more than the Victorian idea of female inferiority."

What is the innate idea of woman to a Hindu? Mr. Mayhew describes it thus:—

"Woman as she presents herself to Hindu imagination, is the priestess of the home, watering the sacred plant, keeping the sacred fire, guarding sacramentally the purity of the food by her ablution and prayers. Her household service is an act of 'bhakti' (personal devotion), she goes abroad only for pilgrimage. *But within the house, she is the centre of all activity, not shut off in any way from the males of varying ages and generations but influencing vitally their home talk, thought and actions.*"

To the Western notion that the Hindu woman is considered in India as unfit for anything higher, Mr. Mayhew replies as follows :—

"She has never been regarded as unfit for arts and accomplishments. Sanskrit literature has many examples of learned ladies and there are women poets. Does not a Sanskrit educationalist draw up a list of sixty-four arts for young ladies? Did not Shankara deign to argue with a woman Pandit?"

Sita and Draupadi, Savitri and Damayanti know how to retain love by other arts than those of the toilet and were *real companions as is the Hindu wife of to-day.*"

Another test of the honour in which woman is held in India is the inviolate nature of her person. "Among the Hindus" as Father Dubois remarks, "The person of a woman is sacred. She cannot be touched in public by a man even with the end of the fingers. How abject soever may be her condition, she is never addressed by anybody, not excepting the persons of the highest rank, but under the respectful name of mother. A dwelling in which only females are to be found, even the hut of the most helpless widow, is an inviolable asylum into which the most determined libertine would never dare to penetrate ; or should he do it, his audacity would not remain unpunished. A woman can frequent the most crowded places without being exposed to the least insult. A male who would stop merely to gaze on a female who is passing by, *as our loungers in Europe are accustomed to do*, would be considered by all as insolent and uneducated person."

Mr. Otto Rothfield in his "Women of India" has the same story to tell. "It is a rule of Indian manners" he points out, "that they (women) should pass unnoticed and unremarked even in the household of a friend and except perhaps among the lowest ruffians, there is none who would offend the



modesty of a woman even by a gesture or unseemly recognition. They can pass in the midst of crowds, as nurses pass in the most evil back-streets, without molestation and insult. *For, the women of India have raised an ideal lofty and selfless for all to behold ; and they have come near its attainment."*

Comparing the treatment of wives in India in the lower classes of society with that in the West in corresponding classes, Mr. Rothfield very pertinently observes :—

“The husband in his cups, may occasionally beat his wife or may have to sit with bowed head before the storm of her boisterous abuse. Yet they compare favourably with similar classes in other countries ; and at the worst they shame the terrors of European slums, the brutal wife-kickers and procurers who lurk in the blind alleys of industrial life.”

Referring specially to industrial workers in congested cities, Mr. Rothfield makes the following observations :—

“Generally, however, it may be said that a Hindu husband even in this class, seldom descends to the grossness and cruelty so often found in the lower quarters of European cities ; while the wife forms and maintains a high standard of womanly conduct and devotion. An easier toleration marks their conjugal relations and *the Hindu character at its*

*worst is commonly free from the extremer modes of brutality."*

Summing up his observations on Hindu marriage life, Mr. Rothfield concludes :—

"In general, it may be said that the Hindu rules of marriage are, in the ordinary sense of happiness, as conducive to the happiness of the spouses as the fast transforming systems of modern Europe and that their happiness is less self-centred and more altruistic."

"The worth of a nation's womanhood" repeats Mr. Rothfield in the last chapter of his book, "can best be estimated by the completeness with which they fulfil the inspirations of love and its devotion ; and judged by this standard, the higher types in India need fear no comparison."

Miss Mayo, as one instance of the low esteem in which women are held in Indian society, refers to what she considers the usual custom of female infanticide. That parents in India have a preference for male children is true. This arises from the fact that in the absence of male child the family would not continue to exist, as the female child would be given over in marriage into another family. But it is totally wrong to suppose that girls are disliked. As to the prevalence of the practice of female infanticide, those who have been talking of it loudest, have not been able to show any evidence of it. If the practice prevails, it should prevail most amon

the Rajputs. On this question, the evidence of Sir George Campbell, K.C.S.I., who served in India from 1842 to 1875 and rose to be Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, and who had very intimate knowledge of the Rajput population, is very valuable. In his "Modern India" (Murray 1852) he states :—

"The murder of female infants, at one time common among certain tribes in certain parts of the country, is sometimes represented to be very general in our Provinces. *But I must say that I doubt the fact.* I do not think that it is likely to occur in present prosperous circumstances among large clans, in which there is plenty of room for inter-marriages without infringing the rule which, prohibits the marriage of blood relations. In fact except among isolated families claiming peculiar rank, girls are very valuable and if child murder did take place to a large extent many instances must come to light.

"If ten such cases be ascertained by the Magistrate, we may well believe that ninety are concealed; but if none are found out, I shall believe in neither ninety nor nine. I have had to do with a considerable Rajput population and have seen nothing of the kind. *I am therefore slow to believe speculative people, who go into a village, pencil in hand, and because they fancy that they see more boys than girls, calculate and propound that exactly one-half of the female infants of the ordinary agricultural Rajputs are annually murdered.*"

This was written in 1852, *i.e.* three-quarters of a century ago and if even among the Rajputs who were most suspected of female infanticide, the practice did not prevail when Sir George Campbell wrote, it is nothing but rashness to say that it prevails to-day to any the least extent, unless of course the British Government or the Indian States have taken special measures in the intervening period to revive and promote the practice, which is unimaginable.

---

## CHAPTER XV

### **The Position of Women—II.**

The part which women play in the daily affairs of life in a Hindu family and also outside the home is also not inconsiderable. They may not possess the masculine temper of the Western women and may not be found rubbing shoulders with men in every walk of life in a spirit of rivalry and competition, and sometimes even antagonism. The Hindu woman's is a spirit of co-operation and assistance and in their own way they admirably share and lighten the burden and responsibility of the cares and management of the family.

Abbe Dubois, the French Missionary quoted in previous chapters, points out in his Letters on Christianity in India that to women in a Hindu family, "belong the entire management of their household, the care of their children, the superintendence of the menial servants, the distribution of alms and charities. To their charge are generally entrusted the money, jewels and other valuables. To them belongs the care of procuring provisions and providing for all the expenses. It is they also who are charged almost to the exclusion of their husbands, with the most important affair of procuring wives for their sons, and husbands for their daughters; and in doing this, they evince the niceness, an attention

and foresight, which are not certainly surpassed in any country; while *in the management of their domestic business, they, in general, show a shrewdness, a savingness and an intelligence which would do honour to the best house-wives in Europe.*"

Regarding the toiling classes, Abbe Dubois is still more explicit. "Besides the management of the household and the care of the family which are (as already noticed) under their control, the wives and daughters of husbandmen attend and assist their husbands and fathers in the labours of agriculture....  
.....Many females are shop-keepers on their own account; and *without a knowledge of the alphabet or of the decimal scale, they keep by other means their accounts* in excellent order, and are considered as still shrewder than the males themselves in their commercial dealings.....In short there is no kind of work, no kind of trade, in a civilized society, in which the Hindu females are not seen actively engaged and occupying a conspicuous place."

Such then is the true position of women in India and of the various functions they perform. They are true help-mates to their husbands and share conspicuously in their burdens and responsibilities; and they are treated not only as equals in the family but sometimes even as superiors. Abbe Dubois again observes :—"The authority of married women within their houses is chiefly exerted in preserving good order and peace among the persons who compose their



families and a great many among them discharge this important duty with a prudence and a discretion which have scarcely a parallel in Europe. I have known families composed of between thirty and forty persons or more, consisting of grown up sons and daughters, all married and all having children, living together under the superintendence of an old matron their mother or mother-in-law. The latter by good management and by accommodating herself to the temper of her daughters-in-law, by using according to circumstances firmness or forbearance, succeeded in preserving peace and harmony during many years amongst so many females who had all jarring interests and still more jarring tempers. *I ask you whether it would be possible to attain the same end in the same circumstances, in our countries where it is scarcely possible to make two women living under the same roof to agree together."*

It is facts like these and his own personal experience, which emboldened Sir Atul Chatterji, the High Commissioner for India in England, to give expression to his belief at an English audience held in January last (Head Mistresses' Conference) that "women in India exercise far greater influence at home than in any country in the world with which I am acquainted." "Their influence outside the homes" he added, "although not so obtrusive is still powerful. The politician, the administrator, and the professional man who neglects the influence of

Indian women at home and abroad, must be a complete failure in his profession."

Let us now turn to the question of widows. Miss Mayo gives a highly coloured and often distorted account of the woes of widows in India. Those who would like to consider this question of widows dispassionately must first disabuse their minds of the impression that prohibition of widow marriage is universal in India. This is not a fact, for except in the higher castes, which altogether amount to about one-eighth of the whole population, widow marriage is permitted.

Says Mr. Otto Rothfield in his "Women of India":—"But the prohibition is not of course universal. Those castes which have not yet set up a claim to the higher ceremonial purities, are free to compound with human desires by a second marriage, devoid of sacramental significance. It is in the higher classes that the women may have to pay for the pride of caste by her individual austerities. *Yet against the prohibition of widow remarriage may be set the terrific wastage in Europe of chaste and unmarried women.*"

Even among the higher castes, the movement for the remarrige of widows has been steadily gaining ground. The old custom of shaving heads has almost entirely disappeared. There are special educational institutions started by social reformers in India mainly supported by funds collected from

the public, to impart useful education to the widows who are now increasingly getting employed as teachers, nurses, doctors &c. The movement thus begun is bound to get momentum in the course of years and bring about a complete transformation of society.

The progress in regard to widow-remarriage, during the last forty years has been succinctly described by Mr. K. Natarajan in his Presidential address at the last session (1927) of the Indian National Social Conference held in Madras. "The number of widows who remarry" he said, "is no doubt very small, but the point is that the opposition to remarriage has become greatly reduced, and the old orthodox idea that a Hindu widow commits a great sin by remarrying, has become largely discredited. If there is not a large number of widow remarriages it is because the competition for suitable bridegrooms is so severe in the case of unmarried girls as to create an actual market for them. It must also be remembered that even in countries where remarriage of widows is freely allowed, only a small percentage of them remarry."

Regarding progress in the matter of women's education, Mr. Natarajan observes:—

"In the matter of the education of women the progress made during the last thirty years has been little short of marvellous and nowhere more so than in this Presidency (Madras). You have now in Mad-

ras City two great Women's Colleges, attended by about four hundred students drawn from all castes and communities ; the number of girls attending high schools and primary schools has also largely increased and it is a remarkable fact that while during and since the war, there has been owing to the economic stress resulting from high prices and increased school and college fees, some retardation in the advance of men's education, these causes have had little effect in checking the steady growth, both numerically and otherwise, the education of girls. I must not omit to refer here to the Women's University at Hingne Budruk which owes its existence almost entirely to the self-sacrificing zeal of Professor Karve, whose services to women's cause in India will always be gratefully remembered by social reformers all over the country.

“Side by side with the progress of Indian women in education, institutions for training them in social service have increased, the most notable of them being the Bombay Seva Sadan founded by the late Mr. Malabari and Mr. Dayaram Gidumal who died only a few days ago, and the Poona Seva Sadan which owes its existence to the practical genius of the late Mrs. Ramabai Ranade.”

It is undoubtedly true that the ground covered so far is very small. But signs all around are very hopeful and if Government would unloose larger funds for female education, a great impetus would be

imparted to the movement. At present, the whole movement is based practically on voluntary effort.

This and the last chapter should be able to remove many of the mis-impressions regarding the position of the Indian women, created in the minds of Western readers, by Miss Mayo's monstrous perversions of truth. The Indian social reformers frankly admit that their position is not all that it should be and their efforts are unceasingly turned in the direction of improving it. The principal agency to bring about this improvement is education and we have already noted progress therein.

It is not out of place here to point out that this progress is hampered by the kinds of undesirable activities in which women in the West engage themselves, and the impression these create on Indian minds. The Calcutta University Commission of 1917-19 presided over by Sir Michael Sadler, state their opinion on the matter, p. 6 of vol. II of their report, in the following words:—

“This distrust of the effects of Western education upon girls is intensified by a dislike of some of the more recent aspects of the emancipation of women in the West.”

Many Indians are afraid, that by reason of the education imparted to them, women in India may be steadily anglicised, “importing into our peaceful homes the evils of suffragetism, or the spirit of revolutionary and rationalistic iconoclasm, condemn.



ing all our ancient institutions that are the outcome of the long past and are part of our blood and flesh as it were."

We on our part are not afraid of such development, but it should be noted that in many minds it does act as a fear and to that extent it hampers progress. We must thank the Western Amazons for this.

An important point in regard to the education of women in India has been brought out by Mr. Arthur Mayhew in his "The Education of India". It is a commonplace that in India there exists a great disparity between the males and the females in respect of literacy. While one out of every eight among the males is literate, among the females only one out of 63 is literate. Who is responsible for this disparity? Miss Mayo's ready reply is that the Hindu customs are wholly responsible for such a situation. According to her, Hindus are totally against female education.

Such however is not the case. Mr. Mayhew in his "Education of India" rightly holds the Government of India responsible for this state of things. He says on page 96 of his book that "by their initial restriction of their efforts to the male population, *they brought a line of division, where it had never existed before, within the household.*"

When Government first directed their attention to educational matters, the problem of the education



of women was not seriously considered and no funds were allotted for the purpose. "The sex which was marked out by nature to be a domestic ornament in England, might safely be left to the same function in India." This was the idea that effectively influenced Government policy then.

When, therefore, the authorities proclaim daily to India, the supreme importance of women's education, Mr. Mayhew sternly and rightly takes them to task and observes:—"What must here be emphasized is that the Government by its timidity and stumbling at the start has been largely responsible for India's inability to take the subject seriously."

After having dealt at length with the problem of women in India, it is but fair to all concerned that we should not disguise our own view of women's progress. We frankly consider that it would be an evil day for India if Indian women indiscriminately copy and imitate Western women. Our women will progress in our own way in the direction of freedom and liberty, preserving their virtues and suitably combining their best with what is best in Western women. We are by no means prepared to think that the Western woman of today is a model to be copied. What has often been termed in the West as the emancipation of woman is only a glorified name for the disintegration of the family.

It is a welcome sign that the best and the most far-seeing minds in the West are slowly realising this.

“The latest critic of modern marriage” wrote Hilda Nield in the *Daily Chronicle* some time ago regarding modern wives in England, “sweepingly describes ninety per cent of the women who marry now-a-days as know-nothing wives; they cannot cook, to darn they are unable, they have the vaguest notion of stocking a store cup-board, and their minds are blissfully blank of the elementary rules of domestic organisation.” We should also think that it is the realisation of this evil that prompted Her Excellency Lady Irwin to make the following remarks in her speech at the All-India Women’s Conference recently held at Dehli under the presidentship of the Begum of Bhopal. Lady Irwin observed:—

“In one respect India is favoured as she comes to close quarters with a problem of which other countries have been pioneers and have made mistakes by which India, if she is wise, may profit.

“They have been slow to recognise the necessity for differentiating between the education of boys and girls. It is, of course, true that they both have to live in the same world, that they both have to share it between them, but their functions in it are largely different. In many countries today we see girls’ education developing on lines which are a slavish imitation of boys’ education.

“It is surely inappropriate that the curriculum for girls should be decided by the necessity of studying for a certain examination so that it must perforce

exclude many, if not most, of the subjects we would most wish girls to learn.

“We must, therefore, as I see it, do all in our power to set a different standard and to create desire in the public mind, and in the girls themselves, for an education which will allow girls, or at any rate the greater number of girls, to develop in other lines.

“What I feel we should aim to give them is a practical knowledge of domestic subjects, and the laws of health which will enable them to fulfil one side of their duties as wives and mothers, reinforced by the study of those subjects which will help most to widen their interests and outlook.”

Mr. Otto Rothfield in his “Women of India” (page 215) very shrewdly observes:—

“But this inner freedom and external amplitude need not be sought and will not be gained in the imitation of foreign manners and customs. Such imitation can never be anything but unnatural and inharmonious; and the castes which have tried it have not succeeded in avoiding evil consequences.”

---

## CHAPTER XVI

### **Disease and Destitution.**

It is one thing to write about social customs, and quite another thing to write about diseases. Every social custom has got its advantages and disadvantages and has had its origin in some social need past or present. Not so with diseases. A disease is an evil unqualified and unadulterated. One, therefore, finds himself in peculiarly difficult circumstances, when he has to reply to the criticisms of Miss Mayo. She may say, for instance, as she practically does, that the whole population in India is diseased and that epidemics thrive in the country.

Whoever ventures to question such a round and sweeping statement is likely to be charged with a neglect for disease and a desire to minimise its importance. The difficulty is aggravated by the fact that there is no well-recognised particular standard which distinguishes a healthy community from an unhealthy one. Our knowledge at present is only comparative. You cannot say that a particular death-rate and birth-rate or a particular incidence of disease denotes a healthy community or an unhealthy community. Even where a comparatively low incidence of disease prevails, there are and ought to be always ground and desire for improvement.

Miss Mayo's criticisms on the subject of diseases and public health may be classified under three heads. In the first place, she wholly ridicules the idea and theory of Hindu medicine. Secondly, she asserts that the Department of Medicine and Public Health is bound to suffer under Indianised control ; and thirdly, she thinks that the people are so stupid that they habitually live unhealthy life, and they are themselves responsible for the diseases &c.

It is the third point which we wish most to tackle. But we shall do that after dealing with the first two. Miss Mayo's ridicule of the Hindu Medicine is by no means out of keeping with her other performances. But her readers, especially Western, are likely to take her seriously therein. Therefore a little disquisition on that will not be out of place.

The high state of development to which Hindu medicine had reached in ancient times has been acknowledged by all scholars. In fact, "it is a matter of controversy whether the Greeks got their medicine (or any of it) from the Hindus (through the medium of the Egyptian priesthood) , or whether the Hindus owed that *high degree of medical and surgical knowledge and skill* which is reflected in Charaka (1st century A. D.) and Sushruta (2nd century) to their contact with Western civilization after the campaigns of Alexander." The writer of the article on "Surgery" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (13th edition, 1926) following Mr. Wise the aut-

hor of the "History of Medicine among the Asiatics" (London 186c) holds the view that the borrowing of the Hindu medicine by the Greeks is more probable.

The said article in the Encyclopaedia Britannica describes at great length the medical and surgical skill of the Hindus in ancient times which almost anticipated the most recent developments. Professor Wilson also observes that "the ancient Hindus attained as thorough a proficiency in medicine and surgery as any people whose acquisitions are recorded." In his "History of Sanskrit Literature," Professor Macdonell points out that "in modern days, European surgery has borrowed the operation of rhinoplasty or the formation of artificial noses, from India, where Englishmen became acquainted with the art in the last century."

It is a well-known fact also that the Hindus were the first nation in the world to establish hospitals. There were hospitals in India in the time of Ashoka (3rd century B. C.) , while according to Sir Vincent Smith, "the earliest hospital in Europe is said to have been opened in the tenth century."

In a speech which Lord Ampthill, Governor of Madras delivered in 1905 at the opening of the King Institute of Preventive Medicine in Madras, he very pertinently observed:—"Now we are beginning to find out that the *Hindu Shastras* also contain a *Sanitary Code* no less correct in principle, and that



the great law-giver Manu was one of the greatest sanitary reformers the world has ever seen."

In the same speech, Lord Ampthill stated on the authority of Col. King that, "the ancient Hindus used animal vaccination secured by transmission of the small-pox virus through the cow," from which it would seem that Jenner's great discovery was actually forestalled by the ancient Hindus." Another interesting discovery of Col. King which Lord Ampthill referred to, was that "the modern plague policy of evacuation and disinfection is not a bit different from that enjoined in ancient Hindu Shastras."

From this it is clear that Miss Mayo's ridicule of Hindu medicine, ancient or modern, is wholly undeserved and only serves to show her ignorance. If the Hindu medicine has not progressed, it is due largely to foreign rule. The system of Ayurvedic medicine has been discouraged and has fallen on evil days. It is a system which has its own peculiarities and advantages, which, as experts believe, sometimes proves a valuable supplement to Western medicine.

Miss Mayo's statement that public health work is badly crippled under present conditions of Indianized control is a lie. It is a part of her propaganda to influence world opinion in favour of the permanence of white domination over India. It would seem that she has taken the trouble of describ-

ing the health conditions in India at length, not from any real desire that these conditions should be improved, but because she wants thereby to show that conditions are so bad that it would be a disaster to India and her population, if the British official (Miss Mayo's angel) is removed or made subject to a responsible Minister.

It is not a fact that under present conditions of Indianized control, the public health work has suffered. There is an insistent demand from the representatives of the public in the legislature for greater expenditure on public health, and the Minister is always responsive to this demand. His hands, however, are always crippled by the reserved half of Government in Provinces (under the present dyarchic system) in whose hands lies the power of the purse. The reserved half allot the lion's share of the finances to themselves, leaving inadequate amounts for expenditure on transferred subjects under the control of the Ministers.

Therefore, Indianized control, far from crippling public health work is promoting it at the insistent demand from the public themselves. There is no fear also that the services of the British official would be dispensed with under increased Indianized control. Public Health Staff is expert staff and India would require many more such experts from England. They are given the necessary powers for doing their work efficiently, but it is absurd for any of them

to hope to supplant the responsible Minister. The elected members of the legislature know their duty perfectly well. They are there to promote the people's interest and compel the Minister to carry out their wishes. To think that the British official knows the people's interest better than they or the Minister, is absurd to the extremest degree.

If further evidence is required in support of our statement that public health work has got an impetus under Indianized control, it would be found in the satisfaction expressed by the League of Nations Interchange of Public Health Delegates who recently visited India, at the "extraordinary progress that had been made all over India during the past six or seven years in public health methods and work, *a progress which they unanimously ascribed to the reforms and to the provincialisation of public health.*"

*(Vide Times of India, dated Feb. 15th, 1928).*

Now let us come to the third and last point of Miss Mayo's criticisms. Miss Mayo in effect fixes the responsibility for the large incidence of disease in India upon the stupidity and unhealthy habits of the people. Now if we examine the history of public health in the West, we would invariably find that in almost every country until a century ago, the habits of the people were as unhealthy as, if not more unhealthy than at present date in India. The people also were as stupid as here in their ideas of public health and in their superstitions also.

Why then did the West advance and why did India lag behind? It is because of the difference between one Government and the other. The Governments of the Western countries spent money like water to stamp out disease, to carry out medical research, and to educate the people in ideas of health and sanitation. The Government in India paid very little attention to medicine and public health. Their chief concern was to facilitate the growth of British trade with India and to provide jobs for Britishers here.

In the face of these facts, Miss Mayo asserts that the responsibility for the prevalence of the diseases lies on the habits and stupidity of the people. The people have been stupid and their habits have been unhealthy not only in India but in all countries. It is the duty of Government to remove such ignorance by a well-directed and long-continued campaign. The Indian Government have neglected to do this. They have only managed to keep up a semblance of progress.

To prove our contentions, let us first briefly trace the growth of public health in England in recent centuries. Dr. Winslow, Professor of Public Health, Yale School of Medicine, in his "Evolution and significance of Modern Public Health Campaign" (1923) has given a very interesting account of the conditions of health in recent centuries in England and the United States. It is not necessary to transcribe the

whole of his account here. Let us take certain periods and mark out the principal points then. First the sixteenth century. In a famous letter of Erasmus to Dr. Francis, the physician of Cardinal Wolsey, the state of the English household in the sixteenth century was described in the following terms:—

“As to the floors, they are usually made with clay covered with rushes that grew in the fens, which are so slightly removed now and then, that the lower part remains sometimes for 20 years together and *in it a collection of spittle of vomit, urine of dogs and men, beer, scraps of fish and other filthiness not to be named.*”

Regarding the state of the waterways, we have Pope's testimony in the *Dunciad* written early in the eighteenth century:—

“To where Fleet Ditch with disemboguing stream,  
Rolls the large tribute of dead dogs to Thames,  
The King of Dykes, than whom no slime of  
mud,  
With deeper sable blots the silver flood.”

One hundred years later, says Dr. Winslow, conditions were still not much improved. In the epoch-making report on the "Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of England" presented by the Poor Law Commissioners in 1842, we read the following:—

“In the parish of Modbury, many of the dwellings of the poor are arranged round narrow courts having no other opening to the main street than a narrow covered passage. In these courts, there are several occupants, each of whom has accumulated a heap. In some cases, each of these heaps is piled up separately in the court, with a general receptacle in the middle for the drainage. In others, a pit is dug in the middle of the court for the general use of all the occupants. In some, the whole courts up to the very doors of the houses are covered with filth. Around this mass, the cottages of the residents are arranged having no back outlet, no back windows or other means of ventilation. The windows and doors of the houses open and look towards this mass; and all the air supplied to the inmates is obtained through these doors and windows. The residents, I learnt, were very frequently subject to fever, and were always regarded as the first to be affected by any epidemic disease.”

The whole of this description strikes like an accurate paraphrase of the opening paragraphs of Chapter 27 entitled “World Menace” in Miss Mayo’s book. Yet it never occurred to anybody in 1842 to say that British health conditions then were a “menace to the world.”

Come next to more recent periods. In the summers of 1858 and 1859, the Thames stank so badly as to rise “to the height of an historic event. Even



ancient fable failed to furnish figures adequate to convey a conception of its thrice-Augean foulness. For many weeks the atmosphere of Parliamentary Committee-rooms was only rendered barely tolerable by suspension before every window of blinds saturated with chloride of lime, and by the lavish use of this and other disinfectants."

"At Home and abroad, the state of the chief river was felt to be a national reproach. 'India is in revolt and the Thames stinks', were the two great facts coupled together by a distinguished foreign writer, *to mark the climax of a national humiliation.*"

Regarding the city of New York, it was reported in 1865:—"Domestic garbage and filth of every kind is thrown into the streets, covering their surface, filling their gutters, obstructing the sewer culverts, and sending forth perennial emanations which must generate pestiferous disease. In winter, the filth and garbage etc. accumulate in the streets to the depth sometimes of two or three feet."

After this, it does not lie in the mouth of Miss Mayo to say that the generality of people in the West show any particular superiority in their personal habits to the generality of people in India.

Count Tolstoy in his epoch-making work "What to do?" describes the very miserable conditions of the poor in Moscow. There are also fourteen volumes of the "Life and Labour of London" by the Rt. Hon. Charles Booth in which are recorded facts

of misery too demoralising to dwell upon. Mr. Upton Sinclair and others have also helped us to see through the surface of Western civilization.

When such filthiness exists in England itself not incomparable to Indian conditions, England may well be regarded as a "World Menace". Indeed, when Miss Mayo disregards similar conditions in her country and points at Indian conditions, we may well retort, "Physician, heal thyself". But we never want to minimise the importance of health, or to justify filthy habits among the populace. What we insist on is that the West should recognise that the habits of the masses in the West are not very much different from those in India. And if conditions in the West have improved, it is because Government have applied enormous funds during recent years to public health work. In India you find the other extreme and an unusually large percentage of the revenues of Government is expended on the Army and Military, leaving quite inadequate amount for nation building departments and a mere pittance for public health work.

---

## CHAPTER XVII

### **Whose Fault ?**

Every impartial student of public health questions must note that, in England itself it was only after the great "fight for national education" was won in about 1860 and only after Government created a special Public Health Department in 1875 to educate people in public health and to provide all facilities for healthy living, that a real improvement was slowly brought about.

Have Government in India taken any pains to carry out a real health campaign in India? According to Government of India's Resolution on Indian sanitary policy, issued on 23rd May 1914, "scientific sanitation in India dates from the end of the last century", and it was only in 1910 that a special Department was created for the purpose. Even this Department was only nominal. Its activities are mostly confined to registering and compiling statistics. It is practically starved for want of funds to carry on a health campaign, or to propagate knowledge of health among the people. As to general education, we have already noted in a previous chapter that only 8·2 per cent. of the people are literate, and Government cannot yet make up their mind to assist the Ministers of Education in the Provinces with sufficient funds to stamp out illiteracy.

Let us now compare the expenditure made by Government on public health in Great Britain with that in India by means of statistics. In 1926-27, the budgetted expenditure on public health services in the United Kingdom amounted to £3·6 million which according to the present rate of exchange amounts roughly to Rs. 4·7 crores. The population of Great Britain according to the census of 1921, numbered 43 million souls. Roughly, therefore, Government in the United Kingdom spent Rs. 1·07 per head of population in the matter of public health.

In India in 1925-26, the funds expended on public health services, both provincial and central, by Government amounted roughly to Rs. 175 lakhs, which divided by the population (247 millions) yield an average of Rs. 0·07 expended per head of population. Compare this with Rs. 1·07 per head in the United Kingdom.

Taken according to area, 4·7 crores of rupees in the United Kingdom divided by the area (89,000 sq. miles) gives an average of Rs. 522 expended on each sq. mile of area. In India, the area (British territory) is about 1·1 million square miles and the average amounts to Rs. 16 per square mile.

If we take medical relief, we find that there is one dispensary in India for every 68,000 inhabitants whereas in the United Kingdom there is one dispensary for every 2,000 souls.

Such is the true position regarding India; the people are ignorant as they were in all countries not excepting England and America until a few decades ago. Filthy habits prevail among them, as they did and still do in many instances among the Westerns. But there in the West, a beneficent Government having the true interest of the people at heart, was determined to bring about improvement at any cost. Here we are suffering the effects of neglect of a people's health by a foreign Government.

It is in respect of public health and medical relief more than in respect of anything else that we realise to-day the truth of the following dictum of John Stuart Mill:— "The Government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality; but such a thing as Government of one people by another does not, and cannot exist. One people may keep another for its own use, a place to make money in, a human cattle-farm to be worked for the profits of its own inhabitants."

Would it indeed be difficult for the Government of India to stamp out malaria for example from the country if there is the will to do it? "Malaria", as Miss Mayo herself points out, "altogether is one of the great and costly nurses of the land, not alone because of its huge death-rate, but even more because of the lowered physical and social conditions that it produces, with their invitations to other forms of disease."

Every time, when some beneficent reform or activity is pressed upon Government, the plea of the paucity of funds is raised. Government as in Bombay can without compunction waste public funds and throw 4 to 5 crores of rupees into the Back Bay, without return in any form whatsoever ; to pay off the debt and interest thereon during the interval, the people of the Presidency have to contribute in the form of taxation no less than Rs. 27 lakhs annually and will continue to do so for sixty years to come. And the Bombay Development Department has had stamped on it from top to bottom and from centre to circumference, the most genuine seal and impress of the British character of administration. If this amount alone could have been utilised for anti-malarial work in that Presidency, the face of the country-side and the sanitary conditions of the people could be changed within ten years beyond recognition.

Modern medical science rightly gives prime importance to the evolution of a healthy body. As Sir George Newman, the chief medical authority in England, observes in his "Preventive Medicine" (1926), "the first line of defence is a *healthy, well-nourished and resistant human body*." It is on this account that great attention has to be given to the conditions of maternity and child-birth. The first step is to secure the birth of healthy children.

Dr. Margaret Balfour, who is doing excellent research work in maternity at the Haffkine Institute,



Bombay, in her series of articles contributed to the Times of India (7th, 9th, 10th February 1928), states therein that "no one who has attended a Baby show in Bombay City can doubt the fact that Indian parents, *even of the poorest classes*, can produce the healthy children". "Is it then not worth while," she asks, "to devote as much time, thought and money to search out the causes of feebleness at birth, as we devote to search out the causes of plague, malaria and other diseases?"

After pointing out how in England and other countries, great attention is being paid to the subject of motherhood and infancy, Miss Balfour observes:—"Nothing of this kind has been attempted in India. Beyond a vague idea that maternal mortality in child-birth is high, there has been little information in India on the subject."

She then stresses the need of "careful scientific research into the causation of these diseases and indeed into the whole question of pregnancy in tropical climates and under tropical conditions." Even in England, as Dame Janet Campbell in her report on "The Protection of Motherhood" has observed, "One maternal life is sacrificed for every 250 babies born and many mothers suffered subsequently from injury which might lead to serious and even permanent physical disability." And this in spite of large funds applied to maternity and research work there.

It is difficult to state with any claim to accuracy the percentage of the sacrifice of mothers to the number of babies born in India. It is probably more than in England but may even be less, for no reliable statistics are available. The uncertainty arises from an important consideration. Life in the West is too much artificial whereas in India natural conditions are still allowed to prevail. To the Western woman, child-birth has terrors. Not so to an Indian woman. The American Red Cross Society, as Mr. Bernarr Macfadden states in his "Physical Culture" (Foreword to the December issue of 1927), announced recently that our (American) percentage of deaths from child-birth is among the highest of all civilised nations.

This, a little digression. The point to be noted is that Government in India should be able to spend large funds for research on maternity work and thereafter to proceed in the direction the results indicate. It is also necessary, as Miss Balfour points out in her articles in the Times of India referred to above, "to appoint mid-wife inspectors, who would gradually bring to the untrained *dais* an understanding of the need for training and to the trained midwives a realisation of the importance of thorough and efficient work."

Regarding the high death-rate associated with the child-birth in England, Sir George Newman in his "Preventive Medicine" says:—"It is impossible

to consider this situation without being convinced of the necessity of State intervention in regard to the function of maternity.....But much remains to be done to ensure *that every woman in child-birth shall receive proper and adequate attention—ante-natal, natal and post-natal.*” If such is the need of England, how much greater the need of Indian mothers should be in this respect,—mothers to the improvement of whose health Government have given scant attention so far ?

The second line of defence *i.e.* after maternity and in fact welfare, is the care of the children. As Sir George Newman on page 68 of his “Preventive Medicine” (1926) observes, “if we would rear a strong and virile race of people, we require more children and healthier children as its foundation.” On page 70, he again says:—“We suffer much of the disease and premature death which occurs between the ages of 18 and 58, first because we neglect to deal with the origins of disease in childhood and secondly because we fail in that period to sow the seeds of hygienic and healthy living—the insistence upon the essential elements of health, *viz.* fresh air, exercise, warmth, nutrition, cleanliness, habit. Thus, childhood is the time for prevention of disease, the nipping of it in the bud as well as for a sound education in a healthy way of life.”

It is for this reason, that medical inspection of school children is an essential part of public health

work. In England, School Medical Service was introduced in 1907 and was extended by the Education Act of 1918. In India, medical inspection of school children does not practically exist. The Bombay Municipality is the only body in the whole of India which has introduced medical inspection of school children within its limits. It is yet a mere beginning, for, "follow up" visits and the provision of clinics are yet under consideration. In spite of these short-comings, considerable improvement has been attained in the health of the school children in Bombay City as the quinquennial report for the years ending 1924-25 of the Bombay Municipal Medical Inspectors conclusively proves.

Surely the Provincial Governments and the Government of India should display a more advanced attitude than the Bombay Municipality. But this question of medical inspection of schools is not only not attended to by these Governments but has been practically beyond their horizon. And in the face of this their most culpable neglect, Miss Mayo is out to attack the people.

One important reason why the Indian population is more easily susceptible to disease than the Western people is their poverty. An Indian is a half-starved creature. He does not get full nourishment. Dr. William Hunter some years ago stated in an address that more than half the population lived on one meal a day. It is unnecessary for us to enter into a discussion of the causes of poverty. Responsible

Indians have held the opinion that poverty is due to or at least is aggravated by certain inevitable results of foreign rule. Whatever the cause may be, it is sufficient for us here to note that the small nourishment of the Indian due to his poverty is one cause of disease.

It is owing to this poverty that many Indians, especially the lower and poorer classes, have to live in unhealthy houses, and one can imagine how easily they can catch a disease or fall prey to an epidemic. What would not life in a slum or a hovel lead to? Writing in "John Bull" some time ago, Mr. A. G. Gardiner, the well-known British publicist, did not express surprise that in England numbers of cases of attempted rape by fathers on their grown-up daughters came before the courts, because, said he, conditions of housing were so bad that persons were simply huddled up in small rooms two or three in a bed.

It is also due to this poverty that poor people cannot afford to take full advantage of medical relief from established dispensaries. If the doctor has to be called to the house, his visiting fee is too high for the average villager to pay. Thus it is only in extreme cases that he ventures to approach a doctor. The daily charges of medicine are also usually beyond his means.

All the same, in spite of these discouraging circumstances of their position, the dispensaries started even in remote and interior villages, either by



Government or by private practitioners, have never had to be closed for want of patients. Several medical practitioners have borne testimony to this fact and one even affirmed that people in villages are as if lying in wait for dispensaries to be opened in their localities. Thus, it is clear that there is no inveterate dislike, as Miss Mayo suggests, to western medicine among even the most backward communities, but they have to resort to other means and traditional methods because the dispensary does not simply exist in their village. In other words, medical relief is practically denied to them by a Government which does not scruple to talk so glibly of the interest of the Ryot.

Miss Mayo, to damn Indian character, refers to the large prevalence of venereal diseases in India and her statement is based on the casual remarks of one or two British doctors in charge of hospitals in India. Now, venereal disease is a disease of civilization of the western type and a number of British doctors have often declared that there is very little incidence of it in India. It is almost wholly a western disease, and one British medical authority in India making special reference to Miss Mayo's statement observed, that in the West every four persons out of five usually suffer from one form or other of venereal disease, whereas in India not one per cent. of the population suffered from it. One reason for this, he thought, was the personal cleanliness of the Hindu which is enjoined upon him by religion.



Here, a word regarding the personal cleanliness of the Hindu would be quite appropriate. With the Hindu, cleanliness is not merely next to Godliness, but it is Godliness itself. It is the Hindus that have taught the Europeans in India to take a daily bath, and to cleanse their teeth daily. In cooking, in eating, utmost purity is observed, because these functions form a part of the religion itself. The food has first to be passed to the God in the family and this in itself ensures its preparation only after bathing and under clean and holy conditions.

In his History of India (page 202), Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone observes :—

“The cleanliness of the Hindus is proverbial. They are a cleanly people and may be compared with decided advantage with the nations of the south of Europe both as regards their habitations and their persons. There are many of their practices which might be introduced even into the North with benefit.”

If in the face of this opinion expressed by Mr. Elphinstone a hundred years ago, we are to believe Miss Mayo's assertion that the Hindus are an unclean race, it would only mean that by contact with the West and with the spread of western education and western ideas, the Hindus have deteriorated in their habits of health, a conclusion which we, on our part certainly believe to be wrong, but which Miss Mayo is bound to accept as true because it is based on her own premises.

Miss Mayo's capacity for ready inferences is very admirable. Because there are advertisements in the Indian papers for cure of venereal diseases, she thinks the disease widely prevails in India. Following such line of thought, one would arrive at the conclusion that because Mr. H. G. Wells' "Tono Bungay" had an unprecedented sale in England, the English people are a devitalised race, having to live on artificial stimulants and medicines to keep up their vitality.

Thus, considered from all points of view, Miss Mayo's criticisms on Indian health conditions and, what is more, her conclusions based thereon hold no water. The more one thinks about it, the more one gets convinced that the essential difference does not lie in the habits of the people, but in the attention given by the Governments to the problems to be solved, and the funds devoted by them to that purpose.

If Miss Mayo has indeed written her book "out of love" for the "peoples of India", and out of gratitude "to that Indian field-labourer who once by an act of humanity saved her life", and not with the object of damning and humiliating the Indian people in the eyes of the world, and obstructing their political aspirations, let her accept the cordial invitation of Mr. Gandhi to come back to India, "live in our midst and reform our lives." That is the test, the only test of her sincerity. As long as she does not accept the invitation, she must remain a coward and a libeller.

## CHAPTER XVIII

### **Eat Beef or Remain Poor.**

Miss Mayo has devoted four chapters to the cow question. She pours forth plentiful ridicule at the idea of the sacredness of the cow. If the Hindus would only learn to eat the cow, they would banish poverty from the land. If the Hindus would only care to destroy the useless cattle, they would soon grow into a prosperous country. How stupid these Hindus are? To regard cow's life as sacred, can there be anything more absurd than that?

But she prefaces this discussion by stating that Hindus drink cow's urine and eat cowdung. Very holy men drink it daily, she says. What impression would a Westerner, unacquainted with the social and religious life of India, carry in his mind from such a description by Miss Mayo? And yet it is only on ceremonial occasions, such as when death occurs in a family or a child is born, that it is the practice in orthodox families to mix a smallest drop of cow's urine or the minutest particle of cowdung in a large quantity of water which is then in usual practice only formally tasted and not drunk as alleged.

Dr. Rabindranath Tagore makes the following very pertinent comments on this allegation :—

“It is a cunning lie against a community which the writer has used when she describes the Hindus as

cow-dung eaters. It is just as outrageous as to introduce Englishmen to those who know them imperfectly as addicted to the cocaine habit because cocaine is commonly used in their dentistry. In Hindu India, only in rare cases an exceedingly small quantity of cowdung is used, not as an ingredient in their meals, but as a part of the performance of expiatory rites for some violation of social convention. One who has no special interest or pleasure in creating ill feeling towards the Europeans will, if he is honest, hesitate in describing them, though seemingly with greater justice than in the other case, as eaters of live creatures or of rotten food, mentioning oyster and cheese for illustration. It is the subtlest method of falsehood, this placing of exaggerated emphasis upon insignificant details, giving to the exception the appearance of the rule."

We next come to the consideration of the contention that as the Hindus do not destroy their useless cattle, they waste enormous amount of wealth every year to feed them. This, it is said, is the principal cause of their poverty. If such arguments are raised, and if attempts are made thereby to evade the main issue, there will certainly be no end to it.

But before discussing this, we shall show that the amount of waste itself is wantonly exaggerated. Miss Mayo argues that out of 146 million cattle, "50 per cent. at a flattering estimate, are reckoned

unprofitable " and this causes an annual loss to the country of £ 117 million.

We may bring to the notice of our readers how in her hurry to prove everything against the Indians, Miss Mayo is prepared to make any reckless mis-statements. She ostensibly quotes from the proceedings of the Board of Agriculture of India, at Bangalore (1924) to say that 50 per cent. of the cattle are useless and unprofitable. Now if we examine these proceedings, we find that the statement there is that, out of 146 million cattle, only 24·5 millions are said to be "superfluous". This gives a percentage of 16 and not of 50 as Miss Mayo states. Besides, "superfluous" does not necessarily mean "useless and unprofitable", as Miss Mayo thinks.

The author of this book is himself a student of rural economics and can speak with some authority on the question. During many of his village investigations, this author found that the percentage of useless cattle was usually 7 to 8 per cent. In one village out of 259 cattle, only 19 were useless. In another village out of 157 cattle, only 11 were useless. Consultation with other workers was made and it was found from them also that not more than 8 per cent. were useless. The Government experts, imported from England, very rarely visit villages and leave much to their imagination, and secondly very often do they intentionally exaggerate the waste, not necessarily with a bad motive but to make an impression of the urgent

need and usefulness of the work entrusted to them, on the populace and Government. As a matter of fact, however, the investigations made in several villages only show that the percentage of useless cattle can at the most amount to only ten per cent.

On this basis then, Miss Mayo's estimate of the amount of waste in India due to the maintenance of useless cattle, is at once reduced to one-fifth of itself, *i. e.*, from £117 million to £23½ million or roughly to Rs. 30 crores according to the present rate of exchange.

Next let us consider that Rs. 30 crores represents the value of the wealth in the form of food for the cattle. To raise this food, a large number of people are now engaged, that is to say, they get their sustenance therefrom. If the useless cattle are destroyed, employment among the people producing food for them will decline to that extent, and other sources of employment will have to be found out for the unemployed. Let us take it that at least Rs. 15 crores, *i. e.*, half the value of the total production represents their labour. Deducting this, the net loss to the country by the useless cattle or in other words the net gain to the country that would result from the destruction of the useless cattle would be no more than Rs. 15 crores.

The question that next arises is "are the useless cattle really useless?" It indeed appears something like a paradox to ask this question, and some people are even likely to ridicule us. Yet we ask in all



sincerity, “are useless cattle really useless?” This at least we humbly affirm, that expert opinion is itself divided. We shall state our authorities and let readers draw what conclusions they like.

In 1921, the U. P. Government appointed a Forest Grievances Committee for Kumaun district of which Mr. P. Wyndham, Commissioner, Kumaun Division, was the president, and Mr. R. G. Marriott of the Indian Forest Service and Mr. Negi, M. L. C., a non-official, were members. This Committee after a very careful and detailed inquiry, in section 13 of their report, unanimously observe as follows:— “We have been much impressed by the stress which has been laid on the functions which cattle perform in the manuring of land and it has been shown to us that *cattle even old and decrepit have their use.*” In section 14, the Committee further stress the point that useless cattle are not really so entirely useless to the owners and cultivators, for they supply the valuable cowdung manure. It is difficult to estimate the value of this manure in coin but we may well take it that it would nearly reach Rs. 15 crores the estimated loss to the country by the keeping of useless cattle. Surely each animal may be expected to give at least ten rupees worth of manure during the year. It would thus appear that the said waste of huge amount comes after all to be a huge hoax.

Let us now consider the same question from another angle of vision. Let us take it for granted

that such enormous waste does indeed result from the keeping of useless cattle. A man cannot live by bread alone. Sentiment also does play an important part in his happiness. Now such sentiment does very often involve considerable economic waste. Mr. Norman Angel's prophesy that war was impossible in the present conditions of highly developed trade relations of the world proved false when the Great War commenced in 1914. If economics were the only consideration in this happiness of man, economic reasons would not be sacrificed so often to sentiments.

The Hindu regards a cow with reverence. Somehow, from ancient times, he has come to hold the belief that the cow is sacred. In tilling the soil, the cow has been to the Aryan in India the most useful animal. She also gives milk. Among ancient Indian Aryans, wealth was measured in cows. Thus slowly but surely the cow has come to be regarded as a very sacred animal. It is sin to kill her. The Hindu beliexes that the cow has got a soul. The European believes she has got no soul.

Similar sentiments prevail in other countries and among other races also. For example, among the Mohomedans, the pig is regarded as an unclean animal whose flesh they would not touch, while the Christians have developed a special taste for pork and bacon.

Thus economic waste occurs among various peoples in various forms, due to the kind of senti-

ment that is uppermost there. Does not Mr. Goldsmith observe in his *Vicar of Wakefield* that "the nakedness of the indigent world might be clothed from the trimmings of the vain?" What great amounts are also being spent every year on the maintenance of dogs and cats and other pets in the household, of whom there are millions, out of a mere sentiment of affection? These pets are entirely useless and by eating away a large part of the food of the country, add to the poverty of the people. Why do not the rational-minded Western people destroy these animals and avoid the waste that is now going on? Or why do they not learn to eat them?

What great waste also occurs now in Europe by the lighting of candles in churches in the name of religion, especially in Catholic churches? We remember to have read in a book on economics by a French author,—we do not remember now exactly which,—that economic waste that results from the lighting of candles in the European churches out of the religious sentiment, amounts to nearly £ 300 million a year. Yet the thing goes on uninterruptedly and nobody questions its propriety. None has so far dared to point out that the poverty of millions of Europe is due to this custom, while European Governments are criticised for their wrong expenditure and extravagance in their respective territories. In respect of India alone, the waste resulting from the keeping of useless cattle is being

sedulously advertised as the main cause of poverty, evidently to direct attention on the wrong track and keep the administration safe from criticism.

The value we attach to human life is also a form of sentiment. Let us suppose a civilised cannibal nation exists, as there do exist civilized cow-eating nations in Europe. Civilization, meaning scientific advancement, and the eating of animals whether man or beast, have no necessary connection with each other. A civilised man may be a cannibal, just as a civilized man of Europe is a cow-eater.

Next suppose, the cannibal nation sends to the United Kingdom their own expert to investigate the source of economic waste in that country. What would that expert report to his native cannibal country in the first instance? What would be the first great waste that would meet his eye and arrest his attention? It will be the appalling waste due to the maintenance of useless, unprofitable human creatures.

How many old, invalid people are there in the United Kingdom to-day? Suppose they number one million. The cost of maintaining these one million invalids would yearly amount to say £ 25 million taking £25 as the cost of keeping alive one man for a year.

Take next the paupers who are fed from the Poor Law funds. The funds expended on these amount annually to an average of £40 million.

Add to these the unemployed whose number roughly amounts to a million. Their cost of maintenance would amount to about £35 million, for, these it should be remembered, are able-bodied persons who consume greater quantity of food.

Altogether then, the cost of keeping alive the total number of these three kinds of useless and unprofitable human animals, the invalids, the paupers and the unemployed, would amount to a huge figure annually of £100 million. What a great national loss to England and an economic waste ?, the cannibal would rightly argue.

If the country would but learn to eat the human animals instead of adhering to the false sentiment of the sacredness of human life, what a great quantity of food, would the useless and unprofitable part of the population prove to the nation? Even if the United Kingdom destroy the useless human animals, it would save yearly no less than £100 million. Do they do it? They do not do it. How very foolish in the eyes of the civilised cannibal?

Now this is no fanciful picture. When an Englishman or an American gets inclined to criticise what he calls waste of wealth by the maintenance of useless cattle in India, the Hindu takes that criticism in the same light as would an Englishman the criticism and observation of the civilized cannibal regarding his own country the United Kingdom.



Therefore this searching in the wrong direction for the causes of Indian poverty is a wild goose chase. It breaks no ice. It only serves to mislead the genuine inquirer, into magnifying a trifle. If the contention were to any extent true, there should exist no poverty among the Mohomedian population in India to-day. The Mohomedans eat beef. They feel no scruple in destroying the useless cattle. Why then do they remain the poorest part of the population in India, much poorer in fact than the Hindus ?

The improvement in the breed of cattle is a thing to which attention of the Government of India has been recently directed. The question has been taken up at the persistent pressure of non-official opinion and is being solved principally by non-official assistance which has been freely offered. Even then one feels Government's attempts are only half-hearted.

Having now proved that the huge amount of economic waste due to the maintenance of useless cattle dwindles into a trifle when thoroughly examined and having pointed out that such waste due to sentiments and beliefs is not unusual in western communities and even in England itself, we shall now examine the remaining allegations of Miss Mayo on the cow question. Miss Mayo observes that though as a matter of fact the Hindu holds the cow sacred, he neglects to feed her properly, actually starves her when she is old and decrepit, and never cares to raise special fodder crops for her.



So far as the Hindu cultivator is concerned, anybody who has some experience of the kind of life lived by the cultivator, will testify that Miss Mayo's charge against him is most cruel. The cultivator himself lives from hand to mouth. His earnings are meagre. From out of these very meagre earnings, he tries to feed his cattle along with his family. Nine cattle out of every ten are useful to him, either as milch cattle or as draw cattle. The remaining useless cattle he also maintains, but at the risk of starving himself. It is a sacrifice which might well deserve the appreciation of his critics. Indeed he is the true observer of the precept of Christ, "share what you have in common". And this sharing in his case extends beyond the human family.

Miss Mayo's remarks regarding the raising of the fodder crops are wholly misplaced. They show her complete ignorance of the peculiar features of rural economy in India. The analogy of her own country is wholly inapplicable. Lala Lajpat Rai who has lived in the United States and has studied conditions there, shows in his articles contributed to the Bombay Chronicle, the difference between India and the United States as follows :—

Firstly the United States have almost double the area of India while her population is only about one-third of the latter. Secondly there is no such thing as a system of annual "land revenue" there. Thirdly the United States Ranchers have the support

of their Government, as cattle raising is a regular industry which is necessitated by the conditions of the land and the sparseness of its population. Fourthly the people are not so poor as to be compelled to raise better paying crops for the payment of Government land revenue and keeping their families alive. Every acre of cultivated land in India is taxed. There are also hundreds of thousands of acres in the United States where nothing can be grown except forage."

It may also be noted here that India's rural economic life from time immemorial has been based on a system of free grazing for cattle in the forest. It is easy to criticise the system but Dr. Voelter the great British specialist in agriculture who was specially invited to India by Government in about 1890 to examine agricultural conditions in this country, quite appreciated the system as specially suited to Indian conditions. The U. P. Forest Grievances Committee from whose report we quoted in a previous paragraph, and of which, as we stated then, two members were British officers (Miss Mayo's agents) unanimously proposed in regard to grazing "that there should be no counting of cattle, no levy of fees and no restriction on number permitted to graze." They recognised that the first function of cattle was to carry manure in the forest, that even old and decrepit animals are useful in this respect, and that "numbers are more important than well-fed herds."

These words ought to satisfy even the blindest critic like Miss Mayo that the responsibility for the insufficient nourishment of cattle lies less on the cultivators than on the Forest Department which limits grazing by irksome and very unreasonable restrictions. That necessary provisions should be made in the interest of forest growth goes without question. But the attempt of the Forest Department has all along been to shut out cattle from the forest, under one pretext or other.

One last charge now remains to be examined. Miss Mayo states that though to the Hindus cow is sacred, the treatment that the cow gets when on the point of death is cruel. When they know that she is about to die, they don't shoot her and kill her to save her from the torture. That direct killing to save torture is kindness according to Western notions, we know and appreciate. But when the Hindu holds the life of the cow sacred, how can he venture to take the life out of the cow even if she be in the pangs of death ? It is the same sentiment that Westerners feel for the human creatures. When a human being is in the pangs of death, it never occurs to another human being even in the West that it would be kindness to relieve the dying creature of his torture by wantonly taking life out of him. The only case that we read about in which the life of the dying person was wantonly destroyed by his relation, was reported in the British press

recently. The fact that the matter was brought before the Police Court itself showed that even if rationally it was kindness to relieve the dying person from the torture of death, the public are still under the governing influence of the sacredness of life, and regard wanton killing in such cases even out of kindness quite unjustifiable.

---

## CHAPTER XIX

### **If the British Withdrew.**

When every other argument fails, as it is bound to fail when pitted against truth, the apologist for the maintenance of the British bureaucratic administration and of the strong hand of the Britisher, comes out with the challenging argument from his armoury as a last resource, "What would you do if the British withdrew? Who will protect you from the chaos and anarchy that will follow, from murder and rapine?"

This 'supreme' position that he takes up, this culminating point of all reasoning, should silence all, he thinks, and assumes the self-complaisant pose of superiority with an air of wisdom on his face and a look of triumph in his eyes. "Unassailable, absolutely unanswerable", his mind revolves round this its own verdict. The Indian, if he is wise must live at the mercy of the Britisher.

Such are the very sentiments expressed by Miss Mayo; and to animate them with flesh and blood, she concocts stories and interviews as is usual with her. Here is one such story:—

"Here is a story, from the lips of one whose veracity has never, I believe, been questioned. The time was that stormy period in 1920 when the new

Reforms Act was casting doubt over the land and giving rise to the persistent rumour that Britain was about to quit India. My informant, an American of long Indian experience, was visiting one of the more important of the Princes—a man of great charm, cultivation and force, whose work for his State was of the first order. The Prince's Dewan was also present, and the three gentlemen had been talking at ease, as became the old friends that they were.

“His Highness does not believe” said the Dewan, “that Britain is going to leave India. But still under the new regime in England, they may be so ill-advised. So, His Highness is getting his troops in shape, accumulating munitions and coining silver. And if the English do go, three months afterward, not a rupee or virgin will be left in all Bengal.”

“To this, His Highness, sitting in his Capital, distant from Bengal by half the breadth of India, cordially agreed. His ancestors through the ages had been predatory Maratha chiefs.”

Referring to this story, the late Mr. Pat Lovatt, Editor of the ‘Capital’, Calcutta, wrote therein as follows:—

“Miss Katharine Mayo is seemingly conscious of her limitations, for she shows a fondness for smoking room stories to eke out her mess of stale kail..... I heard the original of that story much better and more racily told more than forty years ago. The actors were Lord Dufferin and Sir Pertab Singh,



the gallant Rajput who so often acted as Regent to Jodhpur.

"What would happen if the British left India" asked the Viceroy.

"What would happen," replied the Rajput warrior. "I would call my *Jawans* to boot and saddle, and in a month there would not be a virgin or a rupee left in Bengal."

I knew Sir Pertab well, and at the Curzonian Durbar, I asked him if this conversation had ever taken place. "Lie, my friend, a damned lie," he answered fiercely. "We, Rajputs, never offend the inoffensive. When we insult our foes, we give them the chance to retaliate with the sword."

I am tempted to quote Sidney Smith on American gullibility, but why libel a nation for the rantings of an eccentric woman?"

By concocting such stories and giving them out as true in the most unscrupulous manner, Miss Mayo proceeds to establish her arguments. But apart from the lie she has propagated by concocting the story, she casts a slur thereby on the character of the Indian Princes, as if their whole ideal in life is to plunder the helpless and violate the virgins, and not to give protection and good government to the unprotected. It will be remembered, a similar slur was cast by her on the character of Indian public men whom by concocting another story she represented as desirous of "wiping out" the Native

Chiefs. (*Vide* Chapter XIII). It seems to have been her mischievous intention to create a misunderstanding between the Indian Princes and Indian public men and set one against the other.

After indicating the internal troubles that would arise if the British left India, Miss Mayo discusses the great probability, or rather the absolute certainty of invasions from neighbouring countries like Afghanistan, or from bordering populations like the North-West Frontier Tribes. In Miss Mayo's opinion, it is the 60,000 British soldiers that protect the Indians from extinction, from being wiped out of the face of the earth. In holding this opinion, she evidently chooses to ignore the fact which Dr. Tagore has prominently brought to the notice of the world, that "these people have maintained their life and culture without the help of British soldiers for a longer series of centuries" than British or American people have done.

We shall discuss this question presently. But before doing so, we should make it plain that this is not at present a question of practical politics at all. India's demand is not in fact for the complete withdrawal of the British authority and the British troops from India. All responsible Indians have made it plain through their expressed wishes in the legislature itself, that Army and Foreign relations may well be left in the hands of the British Authority in India but that in other matters Government

should be made responsible to the legislature under the suzerainty of Great Britain.

We want to lay stress on this point because we want the British democracy and all the world to know what exactly our present demand is. The author of the "Lost Dominion," by the very misleading title he gave to his book and by his misrepresentations, created the wrong impression in England that India is asking the British to go bag and baggage.

Of course it would be easy for a critic to reply to us by pointing out that the Indian National Congress at its last session (Madras, 1927) passed a resolution demanding complete independence. We consider there is nothing unusual in it under the present provoking circumstances. The wholly unsatisfactory constitution and personnel of the Simon (Parliamentary) Commission, and the complete denial to India of her right to participate in the deliberations of the Commission on equal terms, after her having been recognised, since 1920, as a partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and as an independent Member of the League of Nations, were a direct insult and challenge to India and would upset any sensible and self-respecting body of persons.

Sir Valentine Chirol has stated in his latest work on India that every time the British Government have conceded political reforms to India, those reforms have always come "too late." The

Britisher has in the first place no imagination. He cannot anticipate developments. He concedes only under pressure. It is not the consideration of justice but the absolute unavailability, the clear inevitability under force of circumstances, that influences British conduct in such matters. Secondly, the Government regard that it is generally against British interest to grant larger powers to the people, and have always characteristically opposed any generous advance. Therefore, by the time reforms actually materialise, all grace in the concession, as Sir Valentine observes, has already disappeared. For this reason, the friction, the hatred, the ill-will generated in the process, survive the concession.

Lord Morley, with his unrivalled instinct for political psychology, was alive to this fact while Secretary of State for India. After making up his mind to give reforms to India in response to the continued demand of the people, Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto, the then Indian Viceroy, to expedite the drafting of his scheme. For, he thought, that delay in such matters would provoke Indians to demand reforms for "national reasons". And in order to make sure of the beginning, he even proposed to "open the ball" himself.

It will thus be seen that it is the provoking conduct on the part of Government or the intolerable delay in the granting of reforms that is really responsible for extraordinary Indian attitude.

From the foregoing discussion, it would be clear to the British democracy as also to the whole world that the Indians do not demand a complete withdrawal of British authority and British troops. The next fact is that whether Indians demand it or not, the British are in no hurry to leave India. They are here, their troops are here, not for Indian good but for their own good. . Mr. H. G. Wells has very pungent remarks to offer in his "History of William Clissold" on the hypocrisy of Western nations exploiting the natural resources of the backward countries after securing rights in them by forceful means and calling it the development of those countries in the latter's interest. The truth is that the British want the political control of India, to guard and promote their trade interests here and to find jobs in India for their men. If the British leave India to-day, the unemployment in the United Kingdom would grow so enormously that the people there will actually starve. India knows this perfectly well and any threat from the British that they would relinquish India to her fate is accepted as a joke. The hypocrisy of such threat is patent on the very face of it.

In a recent speech to Oxford students, Lord Birkenhead is reported to have expressed himself as follows:—

"India is our prize possession. We have to live on it. Our own resources can keep us living

only for 6 weeks in the year. And it is the task of you the younger and rising generation to keep India to the last drop of your blood."

In a similar strain spoke Sir William Joyson Hicks who was Home Secretary in Mr. Baldwin's Cabinet some time ago. He said:—

"We did not conquer India for the benefit of Indians. I know it is said in missionary meetings that we conquered India to raise the level of Indians. That is cant. We conquered India as the outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword and by the sword we should hold it.... I am not such a hypocrite as to say we hold India for Indians. We find it as the finest outlet for British goods in general and for the Lancashire cotton goods in particular."

From all this it will be clear that neither do the Indians demand immediate withdrawal of the British from India nor are the British in a hurry to relinquish their authority to the Indians and withdraw from India bag and baggage. These are not questions of practical politics at all. Yet in the discussion of practical reform, such questions are unnecessarily raised to cloud the issue.

The implication behind the threat of withdrawal is that India would not be able to rule herself. Let us grant the contention for the sake of argument. If India has lost the capacity to govern herself, and to maintain law and order, who has reduced her to



such a situation? The British Government in India, when by subsidiary alliances with Native States they took upon themselves the function of keeping order in the territories of the latter, thereby deprived the Rulers of those States of opportunities of developing their capacity to rule. They thereafter became pure pleasure-seekers and easily became targets for Lord Dalhousie's Doctrine of Lapse. This fact is well brought out by Sir William Hunter in his volume on Dalhousie in the "Rulers of India" series, by a long quotation from the London Times.

Thus what power there was in our Native Rulers for independent rule, the British were instrumental in destroying. But more than that, they disturbed almost beyond repair the very political basis of India. We have observed in a previous chapter (Chapter VIII) how village communities formed an essential part of political and economic organisation of India before the British rule and how effectively the existence of these village governments arrested and prevented a state of anarchy. Under British rule, these village governments were first crippled, then abolished, and thereby a great factor of the political stability of India was made to disappear.

Yet in spite of this, even in our present conditions, we are not afraid of any anarchy following the complete withdrawal of the British and the British troops from India. The Indian nation has now felt

its own pulse. We are not to-day what we were in the 18th century. We have long learnt that we are one nation and one people. The Bengalee, the Madrassie, the Mahratta, the Punjabee, all feel that they are Indians. Shall we, in a supreme crisis, fail to take a national decision? We think not.

The very appointment of an unsatisfactory Statutory Commission, a comparatively small circumstance in a country's big life, has united many warring elements. Do we hear so much of Hindu-Mohomedan riots in recent days, since at least the country's attention was concentrated on the Commission? If we can attain so great a unanimity to-day, shall we fail to pool our resources, Hindus and Moslems, in the supreme hour of crisis, if the British leave to-day?

A civil war between Hindus and Mohomedans is sure to result, say some, and they base their arguments on the present Hindu-Moslem tension. These Hindu-Moslem riots have been so exaggerated in the British and foreign press, that one might think there is not a peaceful place or a peaceful day in India. It will be a surprise to many, that all the people involved directly or indirectly in these riots and disturbances up-to-date, do not count more than 0.5 per cent of the whole population of India.

Even these small disturbances are due very often to the existence of a third party, namely a foreign Government. It is not that we mean that

there is any direct incitement by the British official to such riots, though we are not quite sure that the British have yet given up their age-long device of "divide and rule". What we mean to suggest is that where a third party exists, there is no responsibility on the two communities to settle their quarrels between themselves, and this necessarily lead to the continuance of the quarrel. The idea entertained by the British and sedulously propagated by them for their own purpose is that they alone can hold under check the two warring elements. This is putting the cart before the horse. How is it that in Native States there occur few such riots and disturbances?

Let us suppose the Moslems and the Hindus cannot easily arrive at an amicable settlement and a civil war results. But there is an end even to a war. When both parties get tired of war, then at least they would arrive at an agreement, and that agreement is likely to prove a lasting one. What is there unusual after all in a civil war? Was not a great civil war fought in the United States to decide a great issue? So to decide the great issue of a permanent settlement and to bring a lasting union out of a disunion, a civil war in India should not be counted as an evil. The analogy of Switzerland would be even more appropriate here. "It was differences of religious, not of political opinion," says Dr. Woodrow Wilson in his State, "which were in Switzerland the occasion of the strife which was

to bring union out of disunion." The Swiss civil war of 1847, a sharp decisive contest, brought permanent settlement of internal difficulties.

Suppose the civil war instead of leading to the amicable settlement of the differences leads to the victory of one party or the other. Suppose Hindus win. Hindu rule in India has throughout shown toleration to Mohomedans and Mohomedans have never failed to secure entire trust under the Hindu Raj. The Dewan of the Hindu State of Mysore to-day is a Mohomedan. Suppose the Mohomedans will win, and Moslem Raj is established. Even under the rule of the most bigoted Moghuls, the Hindus were fully trusted and were in high and very responsible positions. The position is very much easier now. It may be stated also that the Dewan of the Mohomedan State of Hyderabad is a Hindu.

Whether it is Hindu Raj or a Moslem Raj, there will be nothing like foreign rule in India. Conditions will never be worse than they are to-day. The economic drain will cease altogether. The industries of the country which are in a very depressed condition owing to the invasion and competition of British goods in India under the favourable atmosphere of political control, will revive, and a material cause of poverty will begin to disappear. Is it not a fact that even a staunch Hindu leader like the late Mr. Tilak preferred an indigenous Moslem Raj to British Raj?

But it may be said, there is the fear of invasion from outside, say from the bordering countries such as Afghanistan. Such fear exists even to-day. Are not the British Government apprehensive of the machinations of the Bolshevich Government of Russia? But we do think that once Government is settled in India, whether it be Indian (Hindu-Moslem) Raj or the Moslem Raj or the Hindu Raj, it will take all due precautions to maintain an army and to protect the country from invasions from outside countries.

It may again be contended that while the civil war itself is going on, the foreign invasion may come in and easily conquer the country. We are not quite sure of this. The foreign invasion itself may give an impetus to unity and the foe may be repelled by the combined forces. If a settled Government has already come to exist, the invader will look thrice before he ventures upon an expedition.

After all, the main fear is from Afghanistan ; and Miss Mayo with her virgin, womanish admiration for the North-West Frontier "raiders", of which she has made no secret in her description of them, considers that Afghanistan with the assistance of the North-West Frontier tribes will roast Indians alive. Is that in any sense true? What is the population of Afghanistan? Five millions. What is the population of N. W. F. Province? Half a million. Will these be able to conquer 320 millions of Indians and hold them under control? We are indeed talking of utter improbabilities.



In ancient times, Afghanistan formed in fact a part of India, and was under Indian control. Colonel Tod, in his Rajasthan, points out that the annals of the Yadus of Jaisalmer state that long anterior to Vikrama they held dominion from Gazni to Samarkand. "One thing is now proved that princes of the Hindu faith ruled over all these regions in the first ages of Islamism and made frequent attempts for centuries after to reconquer them. Of these Babar gives us most striking instance in his description of Gazni, when he relates how when the Rai of Hind beseiged Subakhtajin in Gazni, Subakhtajin ordered flesh of kine to be thrown into the fountain which made the Hindus retire."

If in recent centuries, foreign invasions occurred, that was due to the fact that the consciousness of being inhabitants of one country had not dawned on Indians. To-day the position has entirely changed. India has been under one rule for a hundred years and every Indian now firmly feels that his country is India and not a particular district or a province.

Even in the 18th and 19th centuries when there existed the Sikh State of the Punjab, Afghanistan always lived in awe of the Sikhs and as to N. W. Frontier tribes, these were merely treated like chattel by the Sikhs. The N. W. Frontier Enquiry Committee's report throws some light on the precarious position of these tribes under the Sikhs, and yet Miss Mayo writes in the following unscrupulous strain:—



“Yet because of them (the British) and them only, may the Hindu to-day venture the Khyber. Until the Pax Britannica reached so far, few Hindus came through alive, unless mounted and clad as women.”

What an astounding statement? From ancient times, there has been a regular trade carried on between India and Afghanistan and Central Asia and the main route of this traffic was the Khyber pass. The N. W. Frontier tribes were not only kept under check but lived in daily terror of the Governments on both sides of the Khyber. Even before the establishment of the Sikh power, the great Maratha Commander Raghoba Dada struck terror among these tribes, and until very recently one of the roads in the Lahore city, that leading to Shahdara (if we remember aright), was known as the Raghoba Dada Road.

The theory of foreign invasion presupposes that the Afghans are ever ready to jump upon the Hindustan like marauding races whose business in life is plunder and pillage. This is the picture that Miss Mayo draws of them. “Also, behind them lies Afghanistan, like a couchant leopard, green eyes fixed on the glittering bait of India” says she, and “whispering ceaselessly of the glories of a rush across the border that shall sweep the Crescent through the strong Muslim Punjab, gathering Islam in its train.” Are these the sentiments that are

really uppermost in the minds of Afghans today? Miss Mayo indeed does them great injustice. During recent years, Afghanistan has made enormous progress, and whatever ideas they cherished in the past, those ideas certainly do not actuate them to-day. Nor is there much wealth left in India now to excite their cupidity.

And then to represent that the only thing that stops them is "the English"? Surely the Afghans are not afraid of the British at all. Is she certain besides that Indians will stand by the British in case of an Afghan invasion? What could not the Afghans do with the assistance of Bolshevic Russia against England if they have only the will to do it? But they have not the will, and secondly the British win their support by a handsome tribute.

Would it be difficult for an Indian Raj, or a Moslem Raj or a Hindu Raj to secure immunity from Afghan trouble by suitable treaties with Afghanistan? We hope not.

But suppose the worst happens and the Afghans do invade India and establish Afghan rule. How would India be in a worse position than she is to-day? The Afghan king who recently passed through India showed himself to be an enlightened ruler. It was his particular advice to his co-religionists in India to live amicably with the Hindus. In his own territory of Afghanistan, he has placed the large Hindu com-

munity settled there, on equal status with the Moslems and has even forbidden open cow-slaughter to respect Hindu sentiments. Would then the Afghan rule in India be indeed the kind of calamity to us, that it is depicted to be by foreign writers if the British withdrew ?

As a result of the inroads of these Afghans, the Hindus would be extinct, it is again stated, and it is only the 60,000 British troops that keep the latter alive. We ask, would the Afghan invasion, of which imaginary fears are held out, be the first to come to India or have there been invasions in the past and well established Mohomedan Kingdoms also ? How is it then that the Hindus have survived in spite of them ? and they have survived for ages as no other race has survived in the face of so many invasions. The fact is that with writers like Miss Mayo, either the wish is father to the thought or the bogy of the extinction of the Hindu race after the withdrawal of the British, is deliberately raised to win support for the perpetuation of white domination in India.

Let us even grant for the sake of argument, if Miss Mayo so desires, that Hindus will become extinct by reason of the torrent of invasions that she thinks, will inevitably follow the withdrawal of the British. To this, Mr. Gandhi very coolly and tersely replies in the following his characteristic manner :—

“ If as a result of Miss Mayo’s effort, the League of Nations is moved to declare India a segregated country unfit for exploitation, I have no doubt both the West and East will be the gainers. We may then have our internecine wars. Hindus may be eaten up, as she threatens, by the hordes from the North-West and Central Asia,—that were a position infinitely superior to one of ever-growing emasculation. Even as electrocution is a humaner method of killing than the torturous method of roasting alive, so would a sudden overwhelming swoop from Central Asia upon the unresisting, insanitary, superstitious and sexuality-ridden Hindus, as Miss Mayo describes us to be, be a humane deliverance from the living and ignominious death which we are going through at the present moment.”

Thus, considered from all points of view the withdrawal of the British to-day, would not prove such a calamity to the Hindus as that, from anxiety to avert it, they should desire the perpetuation of British domination.

The question is not of practical politics at all. India does not desire to drive away the British bag and baggage even if she can do so. She only desires responsible Government under British rule and for the present she willingly leaves the Army and Foreign affairs to be under the control of the British. Nor is the British threat of withdrawal any the least sincere. It is for their own good that they hold India, for the

maintenance and promotion of British trade, and to enable the Britishers to seek livelihood in India but for which they would starve.

Yet though it is not a question of practical politics, we have discussed it here as if it is one, and by examining all the possible and probable developments of the withdrawal of the British, have proved conclusively that not one of Miss Mayo's conclusions holds good.

---

## CHAPTER XX

### Forward March

This book is not a political treatise. It is in essence a reply to "Mother India." If political questions are discussed herein, it is only to show where Miss Mayo is wrong, where she has misrepresented Indian conditions, and what the true conditions are.

It would not be our endeavour, therefore, to discuss here the future political constitution of India. Such a discussion would require besides a treatise by itself. All that we attempt to do in this chapter is to touch a few points raised by Miss Mayo and to examine a few statements made regarding Indian public men and Indian political advance.

"Why do men of high position make false statements and then name in support documents which, when I dig them out, either fail to touch the subject at all or else prove the statement to be false?" asks Miss Mayo. The suggestion is that Indians of high position are habitual liars; and this suggestion comes from one who is herself the arch-liar. A case of Satan rebuking Sin.

As usual with her, she carefully avoids giving a single instance of a false statement by any Indian of high position. She knows very well that the state-



ment which she asserts to be false will be proved to be true.

Take, for instance, a hypothetical statement that India has grown poorer under British rule. A large number of Indian politicians believe in it and have often made the statement. Miss Mayo with the readiness that characterizes all her writing, would at once assert "no". Are we to say that the statement is necessarily false because Miss Mayo says it is false? In fact the statement is based on the opinion of British administrators, British statesmen, British historians. In chapter V, ample quotations from these authorities have been given to support the statement. At the best you can say that the statement is a matter of opinion. You cannot, therefore, call the Indian politician a liar.

How very strange that Miss Mayo of the United States of America, with her experience of public life there, should charge the Indian politician who is not yet hardened into the bones of manhood, with a habit to lie? The morality of the public men in America and in the United Kingdom is a matter of habitual criticism by writers on politics. Mr. Spender, the author of *Public Life* (2 Vols.) bears ample evidence to the very low esteem in which public men and politicians are held in England and in the West, *i. e.* where popular Government exists, because of their habitual disregard for truth.

In his address on 'Truth and Politics' referred to in the opening paragraph of chapter XI, Mr.

Baldwin, the present Premier, speaks in the same strain. The characteristic word that he uses there is the "holiday for truth", which politicians are in the habit of giving where propaganda and agitation have to be carried on. Miss Mayo's own countryman President Roosevelt, was himself the grand example of a politician who never cared to put truth in the first place.

Mr. Baldwin in his address very lucidly explains the difficulties of politicians in this respect. A democratic government pre-supposes appeal to the masses who can be influenced less by reason than sentiment, and where party government exists, one party to gain public support necessarily calumniates the other party. These are very elementary things which even the man in the street would know. Miss Mayo professes ignorance of the public life in her own country or in the United Kingdom and damns only the Indian politician.

The unscrupulous propaganda to mislead electors in England is more characteristic of the Conservative party than of any other.\* Did not the Conservatives during the last general elections publish on the eve of the elections, the bogus Russian letter, to damn the Labour party?

What we call "hypocrisy in politics" is very excellently dealt with in a very recent book entitled "Future of Government" (Kegan Paul) by Mr.

---

\*Lowell's *Government of England*, Vol. II.

Hamilton Fyfe. Mr. Fyfe observes "that the low standard of political conduct is not the result of politicians being less reputable and more unscrupulous than other people. It is the result of the party system." To show what politicians are like, he mentions that Lord Kitchner after his first experience as Cabinet Minister wrote to a friend about the politicians by whom he was surrounded, as follows:—"Do you know what these people were like? I had no idea."

Those who charge others with lies take a great risk. Like the boomerang the charge often returns upon themselves. Judge not, that you may yourself not be judged. That is the wholesome advice that many should care to follow. Those especially like Miss Mayo who live in glass houses themselves, should not throw stones at others.

Greater men than she have come to grief. In England in the seventies of the last century, Charles Kingsley, a great Anglican divine, charged Cardinal Newman with teaching the duty of systematic falsehood and therein took the whole Roman Catholic clergy to task. In making this charge, Mr. Kingsley caught a Tartar and the immortal "*Apologia Pro Vita Sua*," Dr. Newman's great production, was given out to the world. Not only did Dr. Newman repel the charge but he even established it against Anglicans themselves. "Great English authors, Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Paley, Johnson, men of very different schools of thought, distinctly say that under

extraordinary circumstances, it is allowable to tell a lie." Dr. Newman gave quotations from each of these and asked, "Now, would anyone give ever so little weight to these statements, in forming a real estimate of the veracity of the writers, if they were now alive?"

Another example of a person who came to grief on such matters was the late Lord Curzon. He was the Viceroy of India, and as such was also the Chancellor of the Calcutta University. In his Convocation address, he drew up an indictment against the whole Hindu race and called them liars. The "Amrita Bazar Patrika," a Calcutta paper, then under the editorship of the immortal Motilal Ghosh, achieved the unforgettable journalistic scoop, by quoting fully on the next day of the utterance, the lies that Lord Curzon had himself spoken and boasted of having spoken in his "Travels in the Far East". Greater humiliation did never man feel than Lord Curzon then, and he quietly dropped that portion of his writing from the subsequent editions of his work.

Let the Westerners therefore be careful hereafter, for there is no race on earth which is more truth-loving than the Hindus. Don't judge from a distance; don't trust the lies of Miss Mayo. Come here, live amongst us and find out for yourselves whether what we say is true or not. All foreign observers from ancient times have said it. The Greek traveller Megasthenes, Hiuen Tsiang the Chinaman, Abul Fazal the Mohomedan Historian,

all bear testimony to the essential truthfulness of the Hindu. In recent years, Sir John Malcolm has said that "their truth is as remarkable as their courage," and in his "India, what can it teach us ?" Prof. Max Muller observes :—"It was love of truth that struck all the people who came in contact with India as the prominent feature in the national character of the Indians."

After attacking the character of the Indian public men, Miss Mayo attacks their capacity. "India's elected representatives," she says, "are as yet profoundly unaware of the nature of the duties incumbent upon their office." We may ask Miss Mayo what are her own qualifications to judge of the capacity of these Indian public men ? Is she in any way better qualified to express an opinion on this question than Sir Frederic Whyte the first President of the Assembly ? Yet Sir Frederic Whyte's opinion on the matter is quite emphatic and conclusive.

At the farewell banquet given to him by the Viceroy on September 4, 1925, Sir Frederic observed:—"I take particular pleasure in confessing to-night that the establishment of Parliamentary traditions in the legislative assembly during the past five years, has been more due to the consciousness of the greatness of these traditions shown by all my colleagues in both legislative assemblies than it has been on my part." He was also frank enough to acknowledge that "the ultimate credit for whatever



achievements may stand to the account either of the first legislative assembly or of the second belongs in a greater measure to each individual member and to all members of it than to the chair itself."

Another gentleman Mr. Edwin Haward, Editor of the "Pioneer" and by no means a sympathetic critic, in his paper on the "Indian Legislature" read before the East India Association, London, in 1926, thus concludes his study of the subject:—

"And I venture to assert that whatever form the constitution of India eventually takes, it will be found that to those men with all their imperfections and shadowy claim to a representative status, India owes a deep debt of gratitude. Some may say that they have achieved little. I do not agree. For they certainly have created a common understanding of a great purpose, however diverse may be the means of its achievement, and in so doing they have secured a common appreciation of the difficulty which must be removed to clear the way for smooth development. If they have done only that, they have done something." (Asiatic Review April 1926).

Yet another missile from Miss Mayo's armoury makes its baneful appearance, but proves to be after all on examination the oft-repeated, familiar, commonplace utterance. "India has no electorate, in any workable sense of the word, nor can have on the present basis for many generations to come." What is Miss Mayo's idea of an electorate that she should talk in such malignant tone? The suggestion that she



intends to convey thereby is too clear to be mistaken. Her suggestion is mischievous and her intention malicious. The assertion is made to oblige her angel the British official. As one of her critics has remarked, the writing is of Miss Mayo, the voice is of the Government Bureaucrat.

There are 6 million voters in India to-day. The franchise is fixed too high for Indian conditions. It can and should be lowered to add another ten millions at least to the electorate. It is worthy of note that during the last three elections, the proportions of voters who actually took part in the voting has shown steady improvement, and in the last election, more than 48 per cent. of the electors took part in the voting, for the Assembly alone. Almost the same percentage was recorded in all the provinces except Bihar and Orissa and Central Provinces where the percentage went above 60.\* These figures compare favourably with the percentages in elections in Western countries.

In opening the Punjab Legislative Council in November 1925, H. E. Sir Malcolm Hailey pointed out the advantages of the extension of the franchise in the following words:—

“The extension of the electoral system has brought into the orbit of politics classes whose interests were previously unvoiced and the free discussion

---

\*Return of Elections in India 1925 and 1926 (Government publication).

here of their needs and requirements has given a new aspect to the whole of the public life in the Punjab. The value of this development must not be judged merely by the force of the impact on Government policy or the views of these classes. The awakening of the political consciousness among our rural classes has given them a new outlook as there is an insistent demand among them for better education and vocational training, great activity in availing themselves of character-building institutions such as co-operation, a new and more intelligent interest in all that concerns their economic welfare."

There is thus a clear case for extension of franchise. The low percentage of literacy may be cited as an obstacle. It deserves to be mentioned then that literacy forms no qualification in the present franchise. Why should the low percentage of literacy prove an obstacle? and again if the percentage of literacy is low, are not Government themselves responsible for it?

But then literacy itself is 8.2 per cent of the population and the franchise is given only to 6 millions i.e. about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of the population. Why cannot then the franchise be extended?

We on our part think that this question of literacy in political enfranchisement is over-emphasized. Judgment on a political issue is a matter of common sense and not of literacy, and the average Indian whether literate or illiterate has enough

common sense to understand matters. Literacy may assist but is by no means a guarantee against being misled. All writers on present day politics have shown clearly that, in elections rational arguments have a much lesser influence than other considerations and what is oft termed the political judgment of the average voter is a fraud. It is not true to say that the literate man—after all even in the West such average literacy is only nominal and does not help political judgment,—is less susceptible to considerations other than rational.

The signatories of the Minority report of the Reforms Enquiry Committee (1924) state that “the average Indian voter, both rural and urban, is possessed of sufficient intelligence to understand issues directly affecting his local interests and capable of exercising a proper choice of his representatives”. They also observe that “the repeated use of the franchise will in itself be an education of potent value and the process of education must go hand in hand with the exercise of political power.”

The present percentage of the electorate to the total population in India may be said to correspond roughly to the percentage in England about the time of the first Reform Bill in 1832, and voters then belonged to the rich and privileged classes. The electorate since then increased very slowly. According to Dr. W. A. Chapple (“Function of Liberalism,” *Contemporary Review* 1924), between 1832 and 1867

the number increased to 4·5 per cent, in 1867 to 9 per cent, in 1884 to a little over 18 per cent, and it is only in 1918 that the number rose to over 50 per cent.

But England has enjoyed self-governing powers since 1689. In 1832 though the franchise was limited only to 3 per cent, the power of Parliament was supreme. Even the 3 per cent electorate was only nominal. For, "in 1793, when the Members of the House of Commons numbered 558, no fewer than 354 were nominally returned by less than 15,000 electors, but in reality on the nomination of Government and 197 private patrons. The Union with Ireland in 1801 added 100 members to the House, of whom 71 were nominated by 56 individuals. In 1816, of 658 members of the house, 487 were returned by the nomination of the Government and 257 private patrons of whom 144 were peers".

Even under such an electoral system, Parliament enjoyed sovereign powers. In contrast to this system, the present Indian electorate system has none of the defects referred to. It is a definite and honest system wherein there is a real election and a true vote exercised. And the system is quite capable of extension.

On these grounds the question of the electorate should prove no impediment to political advance at all.

Communal tension especially between Hindus and Moslems is another argument advanced against progress. In the last chapter, we have already stated our belief that the existence of the third party aggravates the dissension. The tension too is very often exaggerated. All the same, the question is being earnestly tackled by responsible bodies and responsible leaders and agreement has been already reached at the All-India Unity Conference at Delhi (February 1928) roughly on the basis of the resolution passed in that connection at the last session of the Indian National Congress.

Then comes Miss Mayo's next line of defence, the depressed classes. Alas, what crocodile tears are shed over these depressed classes! what a shameless hypocrisy! Have Government done anything for these depressed classes when it was in their hands to do the greatest good to them?

It is those who have been styled politicians and agitators that have been in fact ceaselessly working for the uplift of these classes. During the memorable debate in the Assembly on the Simon Commission (February 16 & 18, 1928), one member questioned Mr. Lajpat Rai what he had done for the depressed classes. "I have been working among them for 25 years towards their up-lift," said Mr. Lajpat Rai, "and every time we have asked the Punjab Government to help those classes educationally and to open public wells, our request was refused."



Similarly Pandit Madanmohan Malaviya, another Miss Mayo's politician (they are all self-seeking politicians, not patriots) pointed out during the debate how in the old Imperial Council when he urged the Government "to give the depressed classes full facilities for education and even more facilities than those enjoyed by the more advanced castes", it was Sir Reginald Craddock the then Home Member who wished to refer the resolution to the Local Governments.

Would better proof be required than this to show how the politicians have all along been comparatively more alive to the needs of the depressed classes than the Government which only make use of their existence as a buffer against politicians when the demand for political advance grows insistent ?

In fact, until the reforms all work for the depressed classes was voluntary and practically unaided by the State. Only since the Montford reforms and the Indianised control were introduced, Government have been unable to successfully resist the pressure of organised public opinion, as expressed in the legislature.

Thus the more one considers all the conditions of political advance, the more is one convinced that India is ripe for a substantial advance in responsible Government. Who will admit this in England to-day ?



Strongly entrenched in their power, the British Government think that the monopoly of wisdom lies with them. They spurn Indian thought and Indian advice. Only during the war, they cajoled India to render them assistance and sought their active co-operation in men and money and got it. Where would England be to-day if the Indian army did not hold back the first German onslaught and sufficiently delay the German advance to enable England and France to make their preparations?

To-day England non-co-operates with India, challenges her and insults her. India through her Assembly has accepted the challenge, the only thing that a self-respecting though helpless and hapless country can do. After being recognized as a major, and an equal partner in the British Empire and independent Member of the League of Nations, India is being denied the right of participating in shaping her own destiny.

“Heads that are swollen contain little wisdom” said Pandit Motilal in the debate in the Assembly referring to Lord Birkenhead’s Doncaster speech. This is not the first occasion when wiser counsels have failed to prevail in British Indian administration, and blunders have been committed.

Taking the history of the last twenty years, we find Lord Curzon in 1904-1905 attempting the Partition of Bengal in the face of public opposition and determined protests. These were unheeded first.

and then mercilessly repressed. The discontent went underground to display itself in an ugly form, and the bomb, quite unknown to India until then, came into existence. Did the partition after all survive? that was cancelled in 1912; only the friction remained.

Take next the Rowlatt Act. England had just emerged from a war in which India whole-heartedly assisted her; and in return for India's services, the first gift that England chose to give her was the notorious Rowlatt Act under which men could be apprehended, arrested and detained without judicial trial. The best friends of Government among the Indians, the most loyal spirits, men like the late Sir Surendranath Bannerji and Sir Dinshaw Wacha, advised Government not to enact such a measure because it was a direct insult to India, after her meritorious services during the war. Government spurned the advice and invited Gandhi's Satyagraha (non-violent) campaign which ended with the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre—a darker stain than which there exists not on British name in Anglo-Saxon history.

Did the Rowlatt Act survive? that too went the way of the Partition of Bengal. Only the friction remained.

We ask, therefore, "have Curzonian times returned to-day?" Otherwise we would not find such obstinacy in blunders.

On such occasions, it should be the duty of the Anglo-Indian press to acquaint the British democracy with the true state of opinion in India and to give Government right advice. But truth to tell, all the Anglo-Indian papers, including the ordinarily sane "Times of India," now beat in unison and not only mislead British public by misrepresenting Indian matters and Indian public opinion, but halloo and hearten the Government into "doubtful and dangerous courses."

In his "Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol", Mr. Edmund Burke very rightly observes :—

"Can it be true loyalty to any Government, or true patriotism towards any country, to degrade their solemn councils into servile drawing rooms, to flatter their pride and passions, rather than to enlighten the reason, and to prevent them from being cautioned against violence lest others should be encouraged to resistance ? By such acquiescence great kings and mighty nations have been undone ; and if any are at this day in a perilous situation from resisting truth and listening to flattery, it would rather become them to reform the errors under which they suffer, than to reproach these who forewarned them of their danger."

But Indians are a disarmed people. They can only make helpless protests ; they cannot act. It is this sentiment that actuates the British statesmen to-day. Otherwise they would not remind us in

season and out of season as Lord Birkenhead has done, that we are after all slaves, a conquered people.

Yes, we are a conquered people. We confess it to our shame. And the greater shame is it to those of us (among whom this author includes himself) who have always felt some warmth for British rule in spite of its great shortcomings. Yet, to Britishers we say, be not too confident. He who rides high rides for a fall. We remind you of what your own statesman, Edmund Burke, said in his speech on "Conciliation with America." "There are critical moments in the fortune of all states," said Burke, "when they who are too weak to contribute to your prosperity, may be strong enough to complete your ruin."

To the Britisher, his trade with India is the first essential thing. Would he be able to keep it long without India's good-will? You cannot both eat the cake and have it. You cannot antagonise India and also retain her good-will. You can force your political will on her, however unwelcome it may be to them. But you cannot force her to buy your goods. What would England be without India? a second Holland, says Mrs. Annie Besant.

But, for all the unwillingness of the British Public and the British statesmen to understand India and recognize her grievances, India is going to compel British attention. The struggle is but at its

commencement, and as a loyal citizen of the British Empire, this author is disposed to give expression to the following sentiments in the apt words of Mr. Edward Thompson\* :—

“ Yet may we not ask, Need there be a struggle at all? Having chosen in the case of South Africa the wisest and most magnanimous course of action, that ever showed a nation’s greatness—having at long last the promise of friendship with Ireland, and, through that finish of old enmity, with the United States—having long ago passed safely through the dangerous stages of our relations with Canada and Australia and New Zealand—can we not settle this latest of our great Imperial problems also? Or, if there must be a struggle before there is peace, need it be embittered? ”

There is need at this juncture more than at any other time, for the application of “large and liberal ideas” to Indian politics. “Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom” said Burke.

---

\* *The Other Side of the Medal*, by Edward Thompson, page 21.

## CHAPTER XXI

### Epilogue.

Our task is finished. Miss Mayo's lies have been exposed, her false allegations answered. No more shall the world seek its knowledge of India from her blasphemous book.

Yet hate springs eternal in Miss Mayo's heart. The latest report states that she is now in league with Nazimova the American actress to give her lies "a local habitation and a name".

This Nazimova, we now learn, is staging a dramatic playlet known as "India," which is a parody of Indian life, constructed out of materials supplied by "Mother India."\*

Like Satan, fresh from the sleep of defeat, Miss Mayo might well be singing his famous hymn of hate—

What though the field be lost ?

All is not lost—the unconquerable will,

And study of revenge, immortal hate,

And courage never to submit or yield ;

And what is else not to be overcome ?

---

\*See Ragini Devi's article in "The Bombay Chronicle" February 20, 1928.



Would it indeed be difficult for Indians to stage an equally shameful play, or manufacture a film, parodying American life and exposing its innermost dirt? But let not India do that. The West may forget its Christ to run after Satan, but India cannot afford to forget her Buddha. She shall ever remain true to her heritage.

Let the world realise, that like Titus Oates' "Miss Mayo's very breath is pestilential." The mortal taste of her "Mother India" would bring death into the world.

Happily the power of truth asserts itself, sooner or later. The human heart with all its dross, yearns after heaven. "Children we are, of one God." The world is slowly but surely moving towards the realisation of this eternal truth.

To all nations and races and peoples of the world, we earnestly appeal. *Love Your "Sister India."* Be not misled by the rantings of calumniators, who spread about the malignant contagion of race hatred. Let us all bind ourselves by the ties of active love and mutual helpfulness. In the words of Rabindranath Tagore "let us hope to be rid of the lurking persistence of barbarism in man, not through elimination of the noxious elements by the physical destruction but through the education of mind and a discipline of true culture."

Let then the chorus sing—

“Ring out false pride in place and blood,  
The civic slander and the spite;  
Ring in the love of truth and right  
Ring in the common love of good.”

---

# APPENDIX I

## DRAIN INSPECTOR'S REPORT

**Under this heading, Mr. Gandhi in his *Young India*, dated September 15, 1927, reviewed "*Mother India*" as follows:—**

Several correspondents have sent me cuttings containing reviews of, or protests against, Miss Mayo's *Mother India*. A few have in addition asked me to give my own opinion on it. An enraged correspondent from London asks me to give him answers to several questions that he has framed upon the authoress's references to me. Miss Mayo has herself favoured me with a copy of her book.

I would certainly not have made time, especially when I have only limited energy, and caution has been enjoined upon me by medical friends against overwork, to read the book during my tour. But these letters made it obligatory on me to read the book at once.

The book is cleverly and powerfully written. The carefully chosen quotations give it the appearance of a truthful book. But the impression it leaves on my mind is, that it is the report of a drain inspector sent out with the one purpose of opening and examining the drains of the country to be reported upon, or to give a graphic description of the stench exuded by the opened drains. If Miss Mayo had confessed that she had gone to India merely to open out and examine the drains of India, there would perhaps be little to complain about her compilation. But she says in effect with a certain amount of triumph, 'The drains are India.' True, in the concluding chapter there is a caution. But her caution is cleverly made to enforce her sweeping condemnation. I feel that no one who has any knowledge of India can possibly accept her terrible accusations against the thought and the life of the people of this unhappy country.

The book is without doubt untruthful, be the facts stated ever so truthful. If I open out and describe with punctilious care all the stench exuded from the drains of London and say "Behold London," my facts will be incapable of challenge, but my judgment will be rightly condemned as a travesty of truth. Miss Mayo's book is nothing better, nothing else.

The authoress says she was dissatisfied with the literature she read about India, and so she came to India "to see what a volunteer unsubsidized, uncommitted and unattached, could observe of common things in daily human life."

After having read the book with great attention, I regret to say that I find it difficult to accept this claim. Unsubsidized she may be. Uncommitted and unattached she certainly fails to show herself in any page. We in India are accustomed to interested publications patronised,—'patronised' is accepted as an elegant synonym for 'subsidised,'—by the Government. We have become used to understanding from pre-British days, that the art (perfected by the British) of government includes the harnessing of the secret services of men learned, and reported to be honest and honourable for shadowing suspects and for writing up the virtues of the Government of the day as if the certificate had come from disinterested quarters. I hope that Miss Mayo will not take offence if she comes under the shadow of such suspicion. It may be some consolation to her to know that even some of the best English friends of India have been so suspected.

But ruling out of consideration the suspicion, it remains to be seen why she has written this untruthful book. It is doubly untruthful. It is untruthful in that she condemns a whole nation or in her words 'the peoples of India' (she will not have us as one nation) practically without any reservation as to their sanitation, morals, religion, etc. It is also untruthful because she claims for the British Government merits which cannot be sustained and which many an honest British officer would blush to see the Government credited with.

If she is not subsidised, Miss Mayo is an avowed Indophobe and Anglophil refusing to see anything good about Indians and anything bad about the British and their rule.

She does not give one an elevated idea of Western standard of judgment. Though she represents a class of sensational writers in the West, it is a class that I flatter myself with the belief, is on the wane. There is a growing body of Americans who hate anything sensational, smart or crooked. But the pity of it is that there are still thousands in the West who delight in 'shilling shockers.' Nor are all the authoress's quotations or isolated facts truthfully stated. I propose to pick up those I have personal knowledge of. The book bristles with quotations torn from their contexts and with extracts which have been authoritatively challenged.

The authoress has violated all sense of propriety by associating the Poet's name with child-marriage. The Poet has indeed referred to

early marriage as not an undesirable institution. But there is a world of difference between child-marriage and early marriage. If she had taken the trouble of making the acquaintance of the free and freedom-loving girls and women of Shantiniketan, she would have known the Poet's meaning of early marriage.

She has done me the honour of quoting me frequently in support of her argument. Any person who collects extracts from a reformer's diary, tears them from their context and proceeds to condemn, on the strength of these, the people in whose midst the reformer has worked, would get no hearing from sane and unbiassed readers or hearers. But in her hurry to see everything Indian in a bad light, she has not only taken liberty with my writings, but she has not thought it necessary even to verify through me certain things ascribed by her or others to me. In fact she has combined in her own person what we understand in India the judicial and the executive officer. She is both the prosecutor and the judge. She has described the visit to me, and informed her readers that there are always with me two "secretaries" who write down every word I say. I know that this is not a wilful perversion of facts. Nevertheless the statement is not true. I beg to inform her, that I have no one near me who has been appointed or is expected to write down every word that I say. I have by me a co-worker called Mahadev Desai who is striving to out-Boswell Boswell and does, whenever he is near me, take down whatever he considers to be wisdom dropping from my lips. I can't repel his advances, even if I would, for the relationship between us is, like the Hindu marriage, indissoluble. But the real crime committed against me is described by her at pages 387-88. She ascribes to the Poet 'a fervent declaration that Ayurvedic science surpasses anything that the West can offer' (she has this time no quotation to back her statement). Then she quotes my opinion that hospitals are institutions for propagating sin, and then distorts out of all recognition a sacred incident, honourable to the British surgeons and, I hope, to myself. I must ask the reader to excuse me for giving the full quotation from the book :

"As he happened to be in the prison at the time, a British surgeon of the Indian Medical Service came straightaway to see him. 'Mr. Gandhi' said the surgeon, as the incident was then reported, 'I am sorry to tell you that you have appendicitis. If you were my patient, I should operate at once. But you will probably prefer to call in your Ayurvedic physician.'

"Mr. Gandhi proved otherwise minded.

“ ‘I should prefer not to operate’ pursued the surgeon, ‘because in case the outcome should be unfortunate, all your friends will lay it as a charge of malicious intent against us whose duty is to care for you.’

“ ‘If you will only consent to operate,’ pleaded Mr. Gandhi, ‘I will call in my friends, now, and explain to them that you do so at my request.’

“ So Mr. Gandhi wilfully went to an ‘institution for propagating sin,’ was operated upon by one of the ‘worst of all,’ an officer of the Indian Medical Service, and was attentively nursed through convalescence by an English Sister whom he is understood to have thought after all rather a ‘useful sort of person.’ ”

This is a travesty of truth. I shall confine myself to correcting only what is libellous and not the other inaccuracies. There was no question here of calling in any Ayurvedic physician. Col. Maddock who performed the operation had the right, if he had so chosen, to perform the operation without a reference to me, and even in spite of me. But he and Surgeon-General Hooton showed a delicate consideration to me, and asked me whether I would wait for my own doctors who were known to them and who were also trained in the Western medical and surgical science. I would not be behind-hand in returning their courtesy and consideration, and I immediately told them that they could perform the operation without waiting for my doctors to whom they had telegraphed, and that I would gladly give them a note for their protection in the event of the operation miscarrying. I endeavoured to show that I had no distrust either in their ability or their good faith. It was to me a happy opportunity of demonstrating my personal goodwill.

So far as my opinion about hospitals and the like is concerned, it stands, in spite of my having subjected myself and my wards to treatment more than once by physicians and surgeons, Indian and European, trained in the Western school of medicine. Similarly I use motor cars and railways, whilst holding to my condemnation of them as strongly as ever. I hold the body itself to be an evil and an impediment in my progress. But I see no inconsistency in my making use of it while it lasts, and trying in the best manner I know to use it for its own destruction. This is a sample of distortion of which I have a personal knowledge.

But the book is brimful of descriptions of incidents of which an average Indian, at any rate, has no knowledge. Thus she describes an ovation said to have been given to the Prince of Wales, of which Indian India has no knowledge, but which could not possibly escape it if it had happened. A crowd is reported to have fought it say two the



Prince's car somewhere in Bombay. "The Police," Miss Mayo says, "tried vainly to form a hedge round the car moving at a crawl unprotected now through a solid mass of shouting humanity which won through to the railway station at last." Then at the railway station while there were three minutes for the train to steam out, the Prince is reported by Miss Mayo to have ordered the barriers to be dropped and the "mobs," to be let in. The authoress then proceeds, "Like the sweep of a river in floods, the interminable multitude rolled in, and shouted and laughed, and wept, and when the train started, ran alongside the Royal carriage till they could run no more." All this is supposed to have happened in 1921 on the evening of November 22nd, whilst the dying embers of the riots were still hot. There is much of this kind of stuff in this romantic chapter, which is headed "Behold a Light."

The nineteenth chapter is a collection of authorities in praise of the achievements of the British Government, almost every one of which has been repeatedly challenged both by English and Indian writers of unimpeachable integrity. The seventeenth chapter is written to show that we are a 'world-menace.' If as a result of Miss Mayo's effort the League of Nations is moved to declare India a segregated country unfit for exploitation, I have no doubt both the West and the East would be the gainers. We may then have our internecine wars. Hindus may be eaten up, as she threatens, by the hordes from the North-West and Central Asia,—that were a position infinitely superior to one of ever-growing emasculation. Even as electrocution is a humaner method of killing than the torturous method of roasting alive, so would a sudden overwhelming swoop from Central Asia upon the unresisting, insanitary, superstitious and sexuality-ridden Hindus, as Miss Mayo describes us to be, be a humane deliverance from the living and ignominious death which we are going through at the present moment. Unfortunately, however, such is not Miss Mayo's goal. Her case is to perpetuate white domination in India on the plea of India's unfitness to rule herself.

The picturesque statements that this clever authoress puts into the mouths of the various characters read like so many pages from a sensational novel in which no regard has to be paid to truth. Many of her statements seem to me to be utterly unworthy of belief and do not put the men and women to whom they are ascribed in a favourable light. Take for instance this statement put in the mouth of a prince :

"Our treaties are with the Crown of England," one of them said to me, with incisive calm. 'The princes of India made no treaty with a Government that included Bengali *babus*. We shall never deal with this new lot of Jacks in office. While Britain stays, Britain will send us

English gentlemen to speak for the King Emperor, and all will be as it should be between friends. If Britain leaves, we, the princes, will know how to straighten out India, even as princes should.' " Page 316.

However fallen Indian princes may be, I should want unimpeachable evidence before I could believe that there can be in India a prince so degraded as to make such a statement. Needless to say the authoress does not give the name of the prince.

A still more scandalous statement occurs on page 314 and reads as follows :—

" 'His Highness does not believe,' said the Dewan, 'that Britain is going to leave India. But still, under this new regime in England, they may be so ill advised. So His Highness is getting his troops in shape, accumulating munitions and coining silver. And if the English do go, three months afterward, not a rupee or a virgin will be left in all Bengal.' "

The reader is kept in darkness as to the name of His Highness or of the enlightened Dewan.

There are many statements which Miss Mayo puts into the mouths of Englishmen and Englishwomen living in India. All I can say with reference to these statements is that if some of them were really made by the authors, they are unworthy of the trust reposed in them and they have done an injustice to their wards or patients as well as the race to which they belong. I should be sorry indeed to think that there are many Englishmen and Englishwomen who say one thing to their Indian friends and another to their Western confidants. Those Englishmen and Englishwomen who may chance to read the sweepings gathered together by Miss Mayo with her muck-rake will recognise the statements I have in mind. In seeking to see an India degraded Miss Mayo has unconsciously degraded the characters whom she has used as her instruments for proving her facts which she boasts cannot be 'disproved or shaken.' I hope I have given sufficient *prima facie* proof in this article to show that many of her facts stand disproved even in isolation. Put together they give a wholly false picture.

But why am I writing this article ? Not for the Indian readers but for the many American and English readers who read these pages from week to week with sympathy and attention. I warn them against believing this book. I do not remember having given the message Miss Mayo imputes to me. The only one present who took any notes at all has no recollection of the message imputed to me. But I do know what message I give every American who comes to see me : " Do

not believe newspapers and the catchy literature you get in America. But if you want to know anything about India, go to India as students, study India for yourself. If you cannot go, make a study of all that is written about India for her and against her and then form your own conclusions. The ordinary literature you get is either exaggerated vilification of India or exaggerated praise." I warn Americans and Englishmen against copying Miss Mayo. She came not with an open mind as she claims, but with her preconceived notions and prejudices which she betrays on every page, not excluding even the introductory chapter in which she recites the claim. She came to India not to see things with her own eyes, but to gather material three fourths of which she could as well have gathered in America.

That a book like Miss Mayo's can command a large circulation furnishes a sad commentary on Western literature and culture.

I am writing this article also in the hope, be it ever so distant, that Miss Mayo herself may relent and repent of having done, I hope unconsciously, atrocious injustice to an ancient people and equally atrocious injustice to the Americans by having exploited her undoubted ability to prejudice without warrant their minds against India.

The irony of it all is that she has inscribed this book 'To the peoples of India.' She has certainly not written it as a reformer, and out of love. If I am mistaken in my estimate let her come back to India. Let her subject herself to cross-examination, and if her statements escape unhurt through the fire of cross-examination, let her live in our midst and reform our lives. So much for Miss Mayo and her readers.

I must now come to the other side of the picture. Whilst I consider the book to be unfit to be placed before Americans and Englishmen (for it can do no good to them), it is a book that every Indian can read with some degree of profit. We may repudiate the charge as it has been framed by her, but we may not repudiate the substance underlying the many allegations she has made. It is a good thing to see ourselves as others see us. We need not even examine the motive with which the book is written. A cautious reformer may make some use of it.

There are statements in it which demand investigation. For instance she says that the Vaishnava mark has an obscene meaning. I am a born Vaishnavite. I have perfect recollection of my visits to Vaishnava temples. Mine were orthodox people. I used to have the mark myself as a child, but neither I nor any one else in our family ever knew that this harmless and rather elegant-looking mark had any obscene significance at all. I asked a party of Vaishnavites in Madras where this article is being written. They knew nothing about the alleged obscene

significance. I do not therefore suggest that it never had such significance. But I do suggest that millions are unaware of the obscenity alleged to be behind it. It has remained for our Western visitors to acquaint us with the obscenity of many practices which we have hitherto innocently indulged in. It was in a missionary book that I first learnt that Shivalingam had any obscene significance at all, and even now when I see a Shivalingam neither the shape nor the association in which I see it suggests any obscenity. It was again in a missionary book that I learnt that the temples in Orissa were disfigured with obscene statues. When I went to Puri it was not without an effort that I was able to see those things. But I do know that the thousands who flock to the temple know nothing about the obscenity surrounding these figures. The people are unprepared and the figures do not obtrude themselves upon your gaze.

But let us not resent being made aware of the dark side of the picture wherever it exists. Overdrawn her pictures of our insanitation, child-marriages etc. undoubtedly are. But let them serve as a spur to much greater effort than we have hitherto put forth in order to rid society of all cause of reproach. Whilst we may be thankful for anything good that foreign visitors may be able honestly to say of us, if we curb our anger, we shall learn, as I have certainly learnt, more from our critics than from our patrons. Our indignation which we are bound to express against the slanderous book must not blind us to our obvious imperfections and our great limitations. Our anger will leave Miss Mayo absolutely unhurt and it will only recoil upon ourselves. We too have our due share of thoughtless readers as the West has, and in seeking to disprove everything Miss Mayo has written, we shall make the reading public believe that we are a race of perfect human beings against whom nothing can be said, no one can dare say one word. The agitation that has been set up against the book is in danger of being overdone. There is no cause for fury. I would here close this review which I have undertaken with the greatest reluctance and under great pressure of work with a paraphrase of a beautiful couplet from Tulasidas:

"Everything created by God, animate or inanimate, has its good and bad side. The wise man, like the fabled bird which separating the cream of milk from its water helps himself to the cream leaving the water alone, will take the good from everything leaving the bad alone."

---



## APPENDIX II

**The following letter of Dr. Rabindranath Tagore in connection with "Mother India" was published in the "Manchester Guardian" :—**

May I appeal to your sense of justice and claim a place in your paper for this letter of mine which I am compelled to write in vindication of my position as a representative of India against a most unjustifiable attack ?

While travelling in this island of Bali, I have just chanced upon a copy of the "New Statesman" of the July 16, containing the review of a book on India written by a tourist from America. The reviewer, while supporting with an unctuous virulence all the calumnies heaped upon our people by the authoress, and while calling repeated attention to the common Hindu vice of untruthfulness even amongst the greatest of us, has made public a malicious piece of fabrication, not as one of the specimens picked up from a showcase of wholesale abuse displayed in this or some other book, but as a gratuitous information about the truth of which the writer tacitly insinuates his own personal testimony.

It runs as thus : "The poet Sir Rabindranath Tagore expresses in print his conviction that marriage should be consummated before puberty in order to avert the vagaries of female sexual desire."

We have become painfully familiar with deliberate circulation of hideous lies in the West against enemy countries, but a similar propaganda against individuals, whose countrymen have obviously offended the writer by their political aspirations, has come to me as a surprise. If the people of the United States had ever made themselves politically obnoxious to England, it is imaginable how an English writer of this type would take a gloating delight in proving, with profuse helps from the news columns in the American journals, their criminal propensity and quote for his support their constant indulgence in vicarious enjoyment of crimes through cinema pictures.

But would he, in the fiercest frenzy of his rhetoric running amok, dare make the monstrous accusation, let us say, against the late President Wilson for ever having expressed his pious conviction that the lynching of the Negroes was a moral necessity in a superior civilisation for cultivating Christian virtues ? Or would he venture to ascribe to Profes-

## X

·sor Dewey the theory that centuries of witch-burning have developed in the Western peoples the quick moral sensitiveness that helps them in judging and condemning others' whom they do not know or understand or like and about whose culpability they are never in lack of conclusive evidence ?

But has it been made so easily possible in my case, such a deliberately untruthful irresponsibility in this writer, condoned by the editor, by the fact that the victim was no better than a British subject who by accident of his birth has happened to be a Hindu and not belonging to the Muslim community, which according to the writer, is specially favoured by his people and our government ?

May I point out in this connection that selected documents of facts generalised into an unqualified statement affecting a whole large population may become in the hands of the tourists from across the sea a poison-tipped arrow of the most heinous form of untruth to which the British nation itself may afford a broadly easy target !

It is a cunning lie against a community which the writer has used when he describes the Hindus as cow-dung eaters. It is just as outrageous as to introduce Englishmen to those who know them imperfectly as addicted to the cocaine habit because cocaine is commonly used in their dentistry.

In Hindu India only in rare cases an exceedingly small quantity of cow-dung is used not as an ingredient in their meals but as a part of the performance of expiatory rites for some violation of social convention. One who has no special interest or pleasure in creating ill-feeling towards the European will, if he is honest, hesitate in describing them though seemingly with a greater justice than in the other case, as eaters of live creatures or of rotten food, mentioning oyster and cheese for illustration. It is the subtlest method of falsehood this placing of exaggerated emphasis upon insignificant details, giving to the exception the appearance of the rule.

The instances of moral perversity when observed in alien surroundings naturally loom large to us, because the positive power of sanitation which works from within and the counteracting forces that keep up social balance are not evident to a stranger, especially to one who has the craving for an intemperate luxury of moral indignation which very often is the sign of the same morbid pathology seen from behind.

When such a critic comes to the East not for truth but for chuckling enjoyment of an exaggerated self-complacency and when he underlines some social aberrations with his exultant red pencil glaringly empha-



sising them out of their context, he goads our own young critics to play the identical unholy game.

They also, with the help of the numerous guide books supplied by unimpeachable agency for the grounds of nauseous habits and moral filthiness some of which have a dangerous cover of a respectable exterior; they also select their choice specimens of rottenness with the same pious zeal and sanctimonious pleasure as their foreign models have in besmearing the name of a whole nation with the mud from ditches that may represent an undoubted fact yet not the complete truth.

And thus is generating the endless vicious circle of mutual recrimination and ever-accumulating misunderstandings that are perilous for the peace of the world. Of course our young critic in the East is under a disadvantage.

For the Western peoples have an enormously magnifying organ of a sound that goes deep and reaches far, either when they malign others or defend themselves against accusations which touch them to the quick; whereas our own mortified critic struggles with his unaided lungs that can whisper and sigh but not shout. But is it not known that our inarticulate emotions become highly inflammable when crowded in the underground cellars of our mind, darkly silent?

The whole of the Eastern continent is daily being helped in the storage of such explosives by the critics of the West who with a delicious sense of duty done are ever ready to give vent to their blind prejudices while tenderly nourishing a comfortable conscience that lulls them into forgetting that they also have their Western analogies in moral license only in different garbs made in their fashionable establishments or in their slums.

However let me strongly assure my English and other Western readers, that neither I nor my indignant Indian friends whom I have with me have ever had the least shadow of intimation of this writer as the usual practice in the training of sexual extravagance.

I hope such Western readers will understand my difficulty in giving an absolute denial to certain facts alleged, when they remember the occasional startling disclosures in their own society in Europe and America, allowing to the unsuspecting public a sudden glimpse of systematic orgies of sexual abnormality in an environment which is supposed not to represent "sub-human" civilisation.

The writer in the "New Statesman" has suggested for the good of the world that the people in India condemned by the tourist for malpractices should never be assisted by the benevolent British soldiers safely to preserve their existence and continue their race. He evidently

chooses to ignore the fact that these people have maintained their life and culture without the help of the British soldiers for a longer series of centuries than his own people has.

However that may be, I shrink from borrowing my wisdom from this source and make a similarly annihilating suggestion for his kind of writers who spread about the malignant contagion of race-hatred; because in spite of provocations we should have a patient faith in human nature for its unlimited capacity for improvement and let us hope to be rid of the persistence of barbarism in Man not through elimination of the noxious elements by physical destruction but through the education of mind and a discipline of true culture.

---